arXiv:1210.2078v1 [math.OC] 7 Oct 2012

Path-Dependent Optimal Stochastic Control and Associated Bellman Equations: a Viscosity Solution Approach*

Shanjian Tang and Fu Zhang†

October 9, 2012

Abstract

In this paper we study the optimal stochastic control problem for a path-dependent stochastic system. The associated Bellman equation from dynamic programming principle is a path-dependent fully nonlinear partial differential equation of second order. A novel notion of viscosity solutions is introduced. Using functional Itô calculus initiated by Dupire [13], the value functional of the stochastic optimal control problem is characterized as the unique viscosity solution to the associated path-dependent HJB equation.

Keyword: Path-dependent PDE, Path-dependent HJB Equation, Viscosity Solution, Backward SDE, Dynamic Programming Problem, Representation Theory.

1 Introduction.

A Markovian backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE) is related with a second order partial differential equation (PDE), and a fully coupled forward and backward stochastic differential equation (FBSDE) is associated with a quasi-linear PDE. For details, see Pardoux & Peng [33], Ma, Proter & Yong [31], and Pardoux & Tang [34]. The second order BSDE (2BSDE) is associated to a fully nonlinear PDE. See Cheritdito, Soner, Touzi & Victoir [6] and Soner, Touzi & Zhang [41]. An optimal stochastic control problem is associated to a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation. See Peng [36] and Yong & Zhou [45].

Recently Dupire [13] introduced insightful derivatives with respect to the path for a path functional. He provided a functional Itô formula which non-trivially generalized the classical one (see Cont & Fournié [7, 8] for a more general and systematic research). If the Brownian

---

*supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants \#10325101 and \#11171076), the Science Foundation for Ministry of Education of China (No.20090071110001), and the Chang Jiang Scholars Programme.

†Institute of Mathematics and Department of Finance and Control Sciences, School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China. Email: sjtang@fudan.edu.cn (Shanjian Tang), 09110180028@fudan.edu.cn (Fu Zhang)

path functional underlying a martingale is $C^{1,2}$, then it is also a solution of a linear path-dependent PDE.

In general, the coefficients (the generator and the terminal value) of a BSDE are not Markovian, and they depend on the whole historical path of the underlying driving Brownian notion. In ICM 2010, Peng [37] questioned a path-dependent PDE (PPDE) underlying a non-Markovian BSDE. In view of Dupire's functional Itô formula, it is very natural to associate a BSDE to a "semi-linear" PPDE, and a stochastic optimal control problem of BSDE to a path-dependent HJB equation (PHJB equations). However, a PPDE, even for the simplest heat equation, rarely has classical solution. We refer to Peng & Wang [39] for some sufficient conditions for a semi-linear PPDE to admit a classical solution.

The main objective of this paper is to define a new notion of viscosity solution of PPDE on the space of continuous paths, and to prove the existence and uniqueness of our viscosity solution to a PHJB equation.

In the classical theory of viscosity solution (see Crandall, Ishii & Lions [9] and Fleming & Soner [19]), local compactness of the state space plays a crucial role. The main difficulty for the path-dependent case lies in the fact that the path space is an infinite dimensional Banach space and thus lacks of a local compactness. The arguments in Hilbert space introduced by Lions (see [27, 24]) contain a limiting procedure based on the existence of countable bases, and fail to work in the path-dependent case.

To the best of our knowledge, there are two definitions about viscosity solution for the second order path-dependent PDE. One is proposed by Peng [38], which describes the "parabolic semi-jets", a key technique in the theory of the viscosity solution, on compact subsets of the path space. He proved the comparison principle for nonlinear PPDEs in the sense of his definition using the classical viscosity solution theory for PDE. The other is given in Ekren et al. [14], which describes the "semi-jets" on non compact subsets in terms of a nonlinear expectation. The authors prove the existence and uniqueness of their viscosity solutions for a semi-linear PPDE by Peron's approach. Note that Lukoyanov [30] studied the viscosity solution of the first-order PPDE by adapting the compactness arguments.

In a different way, we define the super- and sub-jets on the sub space of continuous paths without involving any nonlinear expectation (see subsection 4.1). Taking advantages of this innovation, we succeed at proving that the value functional is the unique viscosity solution of the associated PHJB equation. To overcome the difficulty from lack of local compactness, we develop a device to find a part of *every path* at which the given continuous functional obtains its local maximum value (see Proposition 5.6). Here we adapt the smoothing (and viscosity vanishing for the degenerate case) methodology of Lions [26] to our path-dependent case, and also use the natural approximating arguments of parameterized state-dependent PDEs. Since we are treating the fully nonlinear case, in the passage to the limit, our priori estimates on the second-order derivatives of the solutions for the approaching PPDEs play a crucial role.

After we had completed a draft version of this paper, we began to know some further works of Ekren, Touzi, and Zhang (see for details [15, 16, 17], which were sent to us on September 29, 2012) in the conference *"Perspectives on Analysis and Probability in honor of Freddy Delbaen"*

(September 24-28, 2012, ETH, Zurich). This gives us an opportunity to compare their works to ours. On one hand, they directly work with an abstract fully nonlinear PPDE, and use a more complicated definition of super- and sub-jets in their notion of viscosity solution, in particular their definitions involve the unnatural and advanced notion of nonlinear expectation. On the other hand, their relevant results for PHJB equation require stronger conditions: Their Assumption 2.8 requires, as they have noted, the diffusionconfficient σ to be path-invariant (see [17, page 8] for details), and, in the degenerate case, their Assumption 7.1 (i) requires further approximating structures (see [17, page 29] for details). Our Theorem 5.1 (on the non-degenerate case) and Theorem 5.8 (on the generate case) give more general results on the uniqueness of PHJB equations, and provide (invoking the classical theory of deterministic fully nonlinear PDEs) crucial and deep a priori estimates (more precisely see Proposition 5.5 and estimates (5.46)-(5.48) below) on our state-dependent smoothing approximations to the path-dependent HJB equation. Our methodology appears to be simpler and more straightforward. It could be used to study the path-dependent Isaacs equation arising from stochastic differential games (see [43]) and other related fully nonlinear PPDEs.

Backward stochastic PDE is another tool to study non-Markovian FBSDE. Peng [35, 36] established the non-Markovian stochastic dynamic programming principle where he derived the backward stochastic HJB equations in a heuristic way. Ma & Yong [32] gave the relationship between FBSDEs and a class of semi-linear BSPDEs, and further developed the stochastic Feynman-Kac formula. For Sobolev and classical solution of BSPDE, we refer to Zhou [46], Tang [42], Du & Meng [10], Du & Tang [11], Du, Tang & Zhang [12] and Qiu & Tang [40]. For viscosity solution of BSPDE or SPDE, we refer to Lions [28, 29], Buckdahn & Ma [2, 3, 4, 5] and Boufoussi et al. [1]. In Example 4.8, The relationship between PHJBE and BSHJBE is exposed.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the calculus for path functionals of [7, 8] and [13], and preliminary results on BSDEs. In Section 3, we formulate the path-dependent stochastic optimal control problem and disscuss the dynamic programming principle, which is crucial for the existence of our viscosity solution. In Section 4, we define classical and viscosity solutions of PPDE, and prove the existence of the viscosity solutions for the PHJB equations. Finally in Section 5 we prove the uniqueness of viscosity solutions for the PHJB equations.

2 Preliminaries.

2.1 Calculus of path functionals

2.1.1 Space of cadlag paths

In this section we introduce the cadlag path space on which Dupire [13] firstly proposed his functional Itô calculus, which further developed by Cont & Fournié [7, 8].

Let n be a positive integer and T be a fixed positive number. For each $t \in [0, T]$, define

$\hat{\Lambda}^n_t := \mathrm{D}([0,t],\mathbb{R}^n)$ as the set of cadlag (right continuous with left limit) $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued functions on $[0,t]$. Let $\gamma \in \hat{\Lambda}^n_T$, denote $\gamma(s)$ the value of γ at time $s\,(0 \le s \le T)$, and for some $t \in [0,T]$ we denote path of γ up to time t by $\gamma_t := \gamma(s)_{\{0\le s\le t\}} \in \hat{\Lambda}^n_t$. We define $\hat{\Lambda}^n := \bigcup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\Lambda}^n_t$. Write $\hat{\Lambda}$ for $\hat{\Lambda}^n$ if there is no confusion.

For convenience, define for $0 \le t < s \le T$, and $\bar{\gamma}_s, \gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma^x_t(r) &:= \gamma_t(r)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(r) + (\gamma_t(t)+x)\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}}(r), \quad 0 \le r \le t;\\
\gamma^x_{t,s}(r) &:= \gamma_t(r)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(r) + (\gamma_t(t)+x)\mathbf{1}_{[t,s]}(r), \quad 0 \le r \le s;\\
\gamma_{t,s} &:= \gamma^{\mathbf{0}}_{t,s};\\
\bar{\gamma}^{\gamma_t}_s &:= \gamma_t(r)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(r) + (\bar{\gamma}_s(r) - \bar{\gamma}_s(t) + \gamma_t(t))\mathbf{1}_{[t,s]}(r), \quad 0 \le r \le s.
\end{aligned}
$$

We define the quasi-norm and metric in $\hat{\Lambda}$ as follows: for each $0 \le t \le t' \le T$ and $\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'} \in \hat{\Lambda}^n_T$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\gamma_t\| &:= \sup_{0\le s\le t} |\gamma_t(s)|,\\
d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'}) &:= |t-t'| + \sup_{0\le s\le t'} |\gamma_{t,t'}(s) - \gamma_{t'}(s)|. \qquad (2.1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $|\cdot|$ is the standard metric of the Euclid space. It is easy to verify that $(\hat{\Lambda}^n_t, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space, and $(\hat{\Lambda}, d_\infty)$ is a complete metric space.

Definition 2.1. (Continuity). Let $\mathbb{E}$ be a Banach space. A map $u : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{E}$ is said to be continuous at γ_t, if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exits $\delta > 0$ such that for each $\gamma'_{t'} \in \hat{\Lambda}$ such that $d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'}) < \delta$, we have $\|u(\gamma_t) - u(\gamma'_{t'})\| < \epsilon$. u is said to be continuous on $\hat{\Lambda}$ if u is continuous at each $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$, denoted $u \in C(\hat{\Lambda}, \mathbb{E})$. Moreover if u is bounded, we wright $u \in C_b(\hat{\Lambda}, \mathbb{E})$, and if $u(\gamma_t) \le C(1 + \|\gamma_t\|)$ for all $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$ and some constant C, we write $u \in C_l(\hat{\Lambda}, \mathbb{E})$ (linear growth). If $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}$, we use $C(\hat{\Lambda})$, $C_b(\hat{\Lambda})$ and $C_l(\hat{\Lambda})$ for short.

(Lipschitz continuity). Moreover, a continuous map $u : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{E}$ is said to be Lipschitz continuous, if there exists a constant C such that for each $\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, we have $\|u(\gamma_t) - u(\gamma'_{t'})\| < C\, d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'})$, denoted $u \in Lip(\hat{\Lambda}, \mathbb{E})$. If $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}$, we use $u \in Lip(\hat{\Lambda})$ for short.

Now we define the vertical and horizontal derivatives of Dupire [13].

Definition 2.2. (Vertical derivative). Consider functional $u : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$. For the Euclid base $\{e_i, i = 1, \cdots, n\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the vertical (space) derivative of u at γ_t is defined as

$$
\partial_{x_i} u(\gamma_t) : \;=\; \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h}\big[u(\gamma^{he_i}_t) - \hat{u}(\gamma_t)\big], \quad i = 1, \cdots n, \qquad (2.2)
$$

if the limit exists. If (2.2) is defined for all γ_t, we call the map $\partial_x u := (\partial_{x_1} u, \cdots, \partial_{x_n} u) : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ the vertical derivative of u. We define the Hessian $\partial_{xx} u(\gamma_t)$ in an obvious way. Then $\partial_{xx} u$ is an $\mathbb{S}(n)$-valued functional defined on $\hat{\Lambda}$, where $\mathbb{S}(d)$ is the space of all $n\times n$ symmetric matrices.

(Horizontal derivative). The horizontal derivative at $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$ of a functional $u : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$D_t u(\gamma_t) : \quad = \lim_{h\to 0, h>0} \frac{1}{h}[u(\gamma_{t,t+h}) - u(\gamma_t)], \tag{2.3}$$

if the limit exists. If (2.3) is defined for all $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$, we call the functional $D_t u : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ the horizontal derivative of u.

Remark 2.3. Different from the classical derivatives, the horizontal derivative (2.3) is just a right derivative.

Definition 2.4. Define $C^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda})$ as the set of functionals $u : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ which are j times horizontally and k times vertically differentiable in $\hat{\Lambda}$ such that all these derivatives are continuous. Moreover we write $u \in C_b^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda})$ if u and all of its derivatives are bounded, and $u \in C_l^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda})$ if $u \in C^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda})$ and u grows in a linear way.

Remark 2.5. For $u(\gamma_t) = f(t, \gamma_t(t))$ with $f \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$, we have

$$D_t u(\gamma_t) = \partial_t f(t, \gamma_t), \qquad \partial_x u(\gamma_t) = \partial_x f(t, \gamma_t),$$

which shows the coincidence of Dupire's derivatives with the classical ones.

2.1.2 Space of continuous paths

We now let $\Lambda_t^n := C_0([0,t], \mathbb{R}^n)$, the set of continuous $\mathbb{R}^n-$value functions, defined on $[0,t]$ and being $\mathbf{0}$ at t=0, and $\Lambda^n := \bigcup_{t\in[0,T]} \Lambda_t^n$. Here and in the sequel, for notational simplicity, we use $\mathbf{0}$ to denote γ_0 or vectors and matrices whose components are all equal to 0. Clearly, any element $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^n$ lies in $\hat{\Lambda}^n$, i.e. $\Lambda^n \subset \hat{\Lambda}^n$. Then $\|\cdot\|$ and d_∞ in (2.1) work well in Λ^n. $(\Lambda_t^n, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space, and (Λ^n, d_∞) is a complete metric space. The superscript of Λ^n will be omitted if there is no confusion.

Let $\mathbb{E}$ be a Banach space. $\hat{u} : \hat{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{E}$ and $u : \Lambda \to \mathbb{E}$ are called consistent on Λ if u is the restriction of $\hat{u}$ on Λ.

Definition 2.6. Consider a map $u : \Lambda \to \mathbb{E}$.

(i) We write $u \in C(\Lambda)$ if u is continuous at every path $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ under d_∞. We write $u \in C_b(\Lambda)$ (resp. $u \in C_l(\Lambda)$, $u \in Lip(\Lambda)$) if $u \in C(\Lambda)$ and u is bounded (resp. linearly growth, Lipschitz continuous).

(ii) We write $u \in C^{j,k}(\Lambda)$ if there exists $\hat{u} \in C^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda})$ which is consistent with u on Λ, we shall define

$$D_t^i u := D_t^i \hat{u},\ D_x^\alpha u := D_x^\alpha \hat{u}, \qquad \text{on } \Lambda, \tag{2.4}$$

where $0 \le i \le j$ and multi index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ with the non-negative integers $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n$ satisfying $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n \le k$. Similarly, we may define the spaces $C_b^{j,k}(\Lambda)$ and $C_l^{j,k}(\Lambda)$ in an obvious way.

Remark 2.7. By [13] and [8], the derivatives of u in (2.4) is independent of choice of $\hat{u}$, i.e., if $\hat{u}' \in C^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda})$ is another functional consistent with u, then $D_x^i \hat{u} = D_x^i \hat{u}'$ and $D_x^\alpha \hat{u} = D_x^\alpha \hat{u}'$ on Λ. Thernfore Definition 2.6 (ii) is well defined.

2.1.3 Filtration and localization

Now we introduce the filtration of Λ_T. Let $\mathcal{G}_T := \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_T)$, the smallest Borel σ-field generated by metric space $(\Lambda_T, \|\cdot\|)$. For any $0 \le t \le T$, denote $\mathcal{G}_t := \theta_t^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_T) = \sigma(\theta_t^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_T))$, where $\theta_t : \Lambda_T \to \Lambda_T$ is the mapping

$$(\theta_t \gamma)(s) = \gamma(t \wedge s), \quad 0 \le s \le T, \text{ for any } \gamma \in \Lambda_T, \tag{2.5}$$

and σ means the smallest σ-field of the respective sets. $\mathcal{G} := \{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{0 \le t \le T}$ is said to be $\mathcal{G}$-filtration. It is easy to obtain that $\mathcal{G}_t$ coincides with the smallest σ-algebra generated by the collection of finite-dimensional cylinder sets of the form

$$\big\{\gamma \in \Lambda_T ; (\gamma(t_1), \cdots \gamma(t_m)) \in A\big\}; \quad m \ge 1, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^m),$$

where, for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$, $t_i \in [0, t]$.

Let $\pi_t : \Lambda_T \mapsto \Lambda_t$ be the mapping

$$(\pi_t \gamma)(s) = \gamma_t(s), \quad 0 \le s \le t, \text{ for any } \gamma \in \Lambda_T,$$

It is easy to observe that $\pi_t^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_T) = \sigma(\pi_t^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_T)) = \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t)$, the smallest Borel σ-field generated by metric space $(\Lambda_t, \|\cdot\|)$.

A map $H : [0, T] \times \Lambda_T \to \mathbb{E}$ is called a functional process. Moreover, we say a process H is adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{G}$, if paths of H up to time t – $H_t = \{H(s, \cdot)\}_{0 \le s \le t}$ is $\mathcal{G}_t$-measurable for any $t \in [0, T]$. Let $B = \{B(t)\}_{\{0 \le t \le T\}}$ be the canonical process on Λ, i.e. $B(t, \gamma) = \gamma(t)$. We denote $B_t := \{B(s)\}_{\{0 \le s \le t\}}$, it is easily to show that B_t is $\mathcal{G}_t$-measurable. For any continuous map $u : \Lambda \to \mathbb{E}$, we know that $\{u(B_t)\}_{\{0 \le t \le T\}}$ is an adapted functional process.

Let P_0 be the Wiener measure of space $(\Lambda_T, \mathcal{G})$, under which the canonical process B (i.e. $B(t, \gamma) = \gamma(t)$) is a standard Brownian motion. For any integrable $\mathcal{G}_T$-measurable variable ξ, denote $P_0[\xi]$ the integration of ξ under measure P_0.

Let $X = (X(t))_{t \in [0,T]}$ be an n-dimensional adapted continuous stochastic process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}, P)$. For any $t \in [0, T]$, we denote by $X(t)$ the value of X at time t and by X_t the path of X up to time t, i.e., $X_t = \{X(r)\}_{0 \le r \le t}$. X can be viewed as a random map $\Omega \to \Lambda_T$, the continuous and adaption of X shows that X_t is $\mathcal{F}_t/\mathcal{G}_t$-measurable for any $t \in [0, T]$. For any $u \in C(\Lambda)$, $\{u(X_t)\}_{0 \le t \le T}$ is an $\mathcal{F}$-adapted stochastic process.

The following functional Itô formula was initiated by Dupire [13] and later extended to a more general context by Cont & Fournié [8].

Theorem 2.8. *(Functional Itô formula). Suppose* X *is a continuous semi-martingale and* $u \in C^{1,2}(\Lambda)$*. Then for any* $t \in [0,T]$*:*

$$\begin{aligned} u(X_t(\omega)) - u(X_t(\omega)) = &\int_0^t D_s u(X_s(\omega))ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t D_{xx}u(X_s(\omega))d\langle X\rangle(s,\omega) \\ &+ \int_0^t D_x u(X_s(\omega))dX_{(s)}(\omega), \qquad a.e.\ \text{-}\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

A time functional $\tau : \Lambda_T \to [0,T]$ (resp. $\tau : \Lambda_T \to [0,T]$) is said to be a $\mathcal{G}$-stopping time, if $\{\gamma_t : \gamma \in \Lambda_T,\ \tau(\gamma) \le t\} \in \mathcal{G}_t$ for every $t \in [0,T]$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of all $\mathcal{G}$-stopping times. Define $\mathcal{T}_+ := \{\tau \in \mathcal{T} : \tau > 0\}$.

Let $u \in C(\Lambda)$. Obviously, for any constant $\lambda > 0$, $\tau(\gamma) := \inf\big\{t : u(\gamma_t) \ge \lambda\big\} \wedge T$ is a stopping time.

For any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, define

$$\Lambda(\tau) := \{\gamma_t : \gamma \in \Lambda_T, t \in [0,T], t < \tau(\gamma)\}.$$

Definition 2.9. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $u : \Lambda(\tau) \to \mathbb{R}$. We write $u \in C^{j,k}(\Lambda(\tau))$ if there exists $\tilde{u} \in C^{j,k}(\Lambda(\tau))$ such that

$$u = \tilde{u}, \quad \text{on } \Lambda(\tau).$$

We define

$$D_t^i u := D_t^i \tilde{u},\ D_x^\alpha u := D_x^\alpha \tilde{u}, \quad \text{on } \Lambda(\tau),\ 1 \le i \le j, 1 \le |\alpha| \le k. \tag{2.7}$$

Furthermore, we write $u \in C_b^{j,k}(\Lambda(\tau))$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$|D_t^i u|,\ |D_x^\alpha u| \le C, \quad \text{on } \Lambda(\tau),\ 0 \le i \le j,\ 0 \le |\alpha| \le k.$$

Remark 2.10. (i) It is not hard to prove that the derivatives of u is independent of the choice of $\tilde{u}$, i.e., if $\tilde{u}' \in C^{j,k}(\Lambda(\tau))$ is another functional such that (2.7) holds, then $D_x^i \tilde{u} = D_x^i \tilde{u}'$ and $D_x^\alpha \tilde{u} = D_x^\alpha \tilde{u}'$ on Λ. Namely, the Definition of $D_x^i \tilde{u} = D_x^i \tilde{u}'$ and $D_x^\alpha \tilde{u} = D_x^\alpha \tilde{u}'$ is well defined.

(ii) For any $u \in C^{j,k}(\Lambda)$, there exists a $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^+$ such that $u|_{\Lambda^\tau} \in C_b^{j,k}(\Lambda(\tau))$. In fact, for some $C > 0$, we can choose

$$\tau(\gamma) = \inf\Big\{t : |u(\gamma_t)|,\ |D^i u(\gamma_t)|,\ |D^\alpha u(\gamma_t)| > C,\ 1 \le i \le j,\ 1 \le |\alpha| \le k\Big\},$$

u and its derivatives are all bounded by C on $\Lambda(\tau)$.

2.1.4 Space shift

For any fixed $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$ and $s \in [t,T]$, we firstly introduce the shifted spaces on cadlag and then continuous path space.

Let $\hat{\Lambda}_s^{\gamma_t} := \{\bar{\gamma}_s \in \hat{\Lambda}_s; \bar{\gamma}_s(r) = \gamma_t(r)$ for any $r \in [0,t]\}$ be the space of cadlag paths originating at γ_t, and $\hat{\Lambda}^{\gamma_t} := \cup_{t\leq s\leq T}\hat{\Lambda}_s^{\gamma_t}$. Let $\Lambda_s^{\gamma_t} := \{\bar{\gamma}_s \in \hat{\Lambda}_s^{\gamma_t}; \bar{\gamma}_s$ is continuous on $[t,s]\}$ be the spaces with continuous paths originating at γ_t and $\Lambda_s^{\gamma_t} := \cup_{t\leq s\leq T}\Lambda_s^{\gamma_t}$. It is easy to know that $(\hat{\Lambda}_s^{\gamma_t}, \|\cdot\|)$ $((\Lambda_s^{\gamma_t}, \|\cdot\|))$ is a Banach space, and $(\hat{\Lambda}^{\gamma_t}, d_\infty)$ $((\Lambda^{\gamma_t}, d_\infty))$ is a complete metric space.

For any map $u : \hat{\Lambda}^{\gamma_t} \to \mathbb{R}$, define the derivatives in the spirit of Definition 2.2, and define the spaces $C(\hat{\Lambda}^{\gamma_t})$, $C_b(\hat{\Lambda}^{\gamma_t})$, $C_b^{j,k}(\hat{\Lambda}^{\gamma_t})$ in the spirit of Definitions 2.1 and 2.4. We also define $C(\Lambda^{\gamma_t})$, $C_b(\Lambda^{\gamma_t})$, $C_b^{j,k}(\Lambda^{\gamma_t})$ in the spirit of Definition 2.6.

Let $\mathcal{G}_T^{\gamma_t} := \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t})$, the smallest Borel σ-field generated by metric space $(\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}, \|\cdot\|)$. For any $t \leq s \leq T$, denote $\mathcal{G}_s^{\gamma_t} := \theta_s^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_T^{\gamma_t}) = \sigma(\theta_s^{-1}(\mathcal{G}_T^{\gamma_t}))$, here θ is defined in (2.5). $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t} := \{\mathcal{G}_s^{\gamma_t}\}_{t\leq s\leq T}$ is said to be $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t}$-filtration. A time functional $\tau : \Lambda_T^{\gamma_t} \to [t,T]$ is called $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t}$-stopping time, if $\{\gamma_s : \gamma \in \Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}, \tau(\gamma) \leq s\} \in \mathcal{G}_s^{\gamma_t}$ for any $s \in [t,T]$. The set of all $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t}$-stopping is denoted $\mathcal{T}^{\gamma_t}$. Denote $\mathcal{T}_+^{\gamma_t} := \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_+^{\gamma_t} : \tau > t\}$.

For any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^{\gamma_t}$, we define $C(\Lambda^{\gamma_t}(\tau))$ in the spirit of Definition 2.9.

Let $\Big\{H_t\Big\}_{0\leq t\leq T}$ be a $\mathcal{G}$-progressively measurable functional process, and ξ be a $\mathcal{G}_T$ measurable functional variable, let $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$. Define the process H^{γ_t} on $[0,T] \times \Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}$ and the variable ξ^{γ_t} on $\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}$, respectively as the restriction of H and ξ on Λ^{γ_t}, by,

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{\gamma_t} &: = H\Big|_{[0,T]\times\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}},\\
\xi^{\gamma_t} &: = \xi\Big|_{\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We know that $\Big\{H_s^{\gamma_t}\Big\}_{t\leq s\leq T}$ is a $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t}$-progressively measurable functional process, and ξ^{γ_t} is a $\mathcal{G}_T^{\gamma_t}$-measurable functional variable. Especially, $\tau^{\gamma_t} \in \mathcal{T}^{\gamma_t}$ if $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, and τ^{γ_t} runs through $\mathcal{T}^{\gamma_t}$ when τ reads through $\mathcal{T}$.

Let B^{γ_t} be the canonical process on Λ^{γ_t}, we denote $P_0^{\gamma_t}$ the Wiener measure of the measurable space $(\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}, \mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t})$, under which the process $(B^{\gamma_t}(s) - B^{\gamma_t}(t))_{t\leq s\leq T}$ is a standard Brownian motion. For any integrable $\mathcal{G}_T^{\gamma_t}$-measurable variable ξ, $P_0^{\gamma_t}[\xi]$ is the integral of ξ w.r.t. measure $P_0^{\gamma_t}$.

2.2 Backward stochastic differential equations

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}, P)$ be a probability space with the usual condition (see Karatzas and Shreve [20]), and $W(s)_{\{0\leq s\leq T\}}$ be the d dimensional standard Brownian motion. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the collection of all P-null sets in Ω, for any $0 \leq t \leq r \leq T$, $\mathcal{F}_r^t$ denotes the completion of $\sigma(W(s) - W(t); t \leq s \leq r)$, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_r^t = \sigma(W(s) - W(t); t \leq s \leq r) \cup \mathcal{N}$. We also write $\mathcal{F}^t$ for $\{\mathcal{F}_s^t\}_{s\leq t\leq T}$.

For any $0 \leq t \leq T$, we denote by $M^2(t,T)$ the space of all $\mathcal{F}^t$-adapted, $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes $Y(s)_{t\leq s\leq T}$ with $E[\int_t^T |Y(s)|^2 ds] < \infty$ and $S^2(0,T)$ the space of all $\mathcal{F}^t$-adapted, $\mathbb{R}$-valued continuous processes $Y(s)_{t\leq s\leq T}$ with $E[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} |Y(s)|^2] < \infty$.

Now let us consider $f : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with the property that $f(t,y,z)_{t\in[0,T]}$ is progressively measurable for each $(y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and we also make the following assumptions on f in this subsection:

(i) f is uniformly Lipschitz continuous about $(y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$;

(ii) $f(\cdot,0,0) \in M^2(0,T)$.

Lemma 2.11. *Under the assumptions (i) and (ii), for any random variable $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P)$, the BSDE*

$$Y(t) = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y(t), Z(s))ds - \int_t^T Z(s)dW_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{2.8}$$

has a unique adapted solution $(Y(t), Z(t))_{t\in[0,T]} \in S^2(0,T) \times M^2(0,T)$.

We recall the following comparison theorem on BSDEs, which is well-known comparison theorem (see El Karoui, Peng, Quenez [18])

Lemma 2.12. *(Comparison theorem). Given two coefficients f_1 and f_2 satisfying above assumptions and two terminal values ξ_1, $\xi_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$, we denote by (Y^1, Z^1) and (Y^2, Z^2) the solution of BSDE with the data (ξ_1, f_1) and (ξ_2, f_2), respectively. Then we have:*

(1) (Monotonicity). If $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$ and $\tilde{f}_1 \geq \tilde{f}_2$, a.s., then $Y^1(t) \geq Y^2(t)$, a.s., for all $t \in [0,T]$.

(2) (Strict monotonicity). If, in addition to (1), we also $P\{\xi_1 > \xi_2\}>0$, then $P\{Y^1(t) > Y^2(t)\} > 0$, $0 \leq t < T$, and in particular, $Y^1(0) > Y^2(0)$.

3 Formulation of the path-dependent optimal stochastic control problem and dynamic programming principle

The frame of dynamic programming principle (DPP) in this section is parallel with the Markovian case. One can easily obtain this DPP by mimicking the method in [35, 36]. But for the convenience of reader we state the details as follows.

To study path-dependent HJB equations, we draw the support from the forward and backward stochastic systems, which describe the stochastic optimal problems. Let the set of admissible control processes $\mathcal{U}$ be the set of all $\mathcal{F}-$progressively measurable process valued in some compact metric space U. For any $t \in [0,T]$, $p \geq 1$, $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t; \Lambda_t, \mathcal{G}_t)$ is the set of all $\mathcal{F}_t/\mathcal{G}_t$-measurable maps $\Gamma_t : \Omega \to \Lambda_t$ satisfying $E\|\Gamma_t\|^p < \infty$.

Consider the following functionals $b : \Lambda \times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : \Lambda \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, $g : \Lambda_T \to \mathbb{R}$ and $f : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}$. We make the following assumption.

(H1) *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all* $(t, \gamma_T, y, z, \alpha), (t', \gamma'_T, y', z', \alpha') \in$

$[0,T]\times\Lambda_T\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times U$,

$$\begin{aligned}|b(\gamma_t,\alpha)-b(\gamma'_{t'},\alpha')| &\le C(d_\infty(\gamma_t,\gamma'_{t'})+|\alpha-\alpha'|),\\ |\sigma(\gamma_t,\alpha)-\sigma(\gamma'_{t'},\alpha')| &\le C(d_\infty(\gamma_t,\gamma'_{t'})+|\alpha-\alpha'|),\\ |f(\gamma_t,y,z,\alpha)-f(\gamma'_{t'},y',z',\alpha')| &\le C(d_\infty(\gamma_t,\gamma'_{t'})+|y-y'|+|z-z'|+|\alpha-\alpha'|),\\ |g(\gamma_T)-g(\gamma'_T)| &\le C\|\gamma_T-\gamma'_T\|.\end{aligned}$$

For given $t\in[0,T)$, $\mathcal{F}_t/\mathcal{G}_t$-measurable map $\Gamma_t:\Omega\to\Lambda_t$ and admissible control $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, the according orbit which regards Γ_t as the initial state is defined by the solution of the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases}X^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s)=\Gamma_t(s), & \text{all } \omega,\ s\in[0,t];\\ X^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s)=\Gamma_t(t)+\int_t^s b(X_r^{\Gamma_t,\alpha},\alpha(r))dr+\int_t^s\sigma(X_r^{\Gamma_t,\alpha},\alpha(r))dW(r), & \text{a.e.-}\omega,\ \ s\in[t,T].\end{cases}\tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Under assumption (H1), let positive real number $p\ge 2$, for any $t\in[0,T]$, $\Gamma_t\in L^p(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t;\Lambda_t,\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$, $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, SDE* (3.1) *admits a unique (strong) solution $X^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}:\Omega\to\Lambda_T$ satisfies that $X_s^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}:\Omega\to\Lambda_s$ is $\mathcal{F}_s/\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_s)$ measurable for all $s\in[t,T]$, and $E[\|X_T^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p]<\infty$. Moreover there exists $C_P\in R$, such that for any $t\in[0,T]$, $\alpha(\cdot),\alpha'(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, $\Gamma_t,\Gamma'_t\in L^p(\Omega,\Lambda_t;\mathcal{F}_t/\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$, we have the following estimates, P-a.s.,*

$$\begin{aligned}E[\|X_T^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}-X_T^{\Gamma'_t,\alpha'}\|^p|\mathcal{F}_t] &\le C_p\big(E\|\Gamma_t-\Gamma'_t\|^p+\int_t^T|\alpha(s)-\alpha'(s)|^pds\big),\\ E[\|X_T^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p|\mathcal{F}_t] &\le C_p\big(1+E\|\Gamma_t\|^p\big),\\ E[\|X_{s,r}^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}-X_r^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p|\mathcal{F}_t] &\le C_p\big(1+E\|\Gamma_t\|^p\big)|r-s|^{\frac{p}{2}},\quad t\le s\le r\le T\end{aligned}$$

The constant C_p only depends on the Lipschitz constant of b and σ about γ_t and time T.

Combing Lemmas 2.11 and 3.1, we have

Lemma 3.2. *Let (H1) holds, for any $t\in[0,T]$, $p\ge 2$, $\Gamma_t\in L^p(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t;\Lambda_t,\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$ and $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, $X^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}$ is the solution of the stochastic equation* (3.1), *then the BSDE*

$$\begin{aligned}Y_s^{\Gamma_t,\alpha} &= g(X_T^{\Gamma_t,\alpha})+\int_s^T f(X_r^{\Gamma_t,\alpha},Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(r),Z^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(r),\alpha(r))dr\\ &\quad-\int_s^T Z^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(r)dB(r),\quad a.e.P,\ all\ s\in[t,T],\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

has a unique solution

$$(Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s),Z^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s))_{t\le s\le T}\in S^2(t,T)\times M^2(t,T).$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant C_p*, such that, for any* $t \in [0,T]$, $\Gamma_t, \Gamma'_t \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t; \Lambda_t, \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$, $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$*,* P*-a.s.,*

$$E\Big[\sup_{t\le s\le T}|Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s)-Y^{\Gamma'_t,\alpha'}(s)|^p\big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] \le C_p\big(E\|\Gamma_t-\Gamma'_t\|^p + E\int_t^T|\alpha(r)-\alpha'(r)|^p dr\big), \tag{3.3}$$

$$E\Big[\sup_{t\le s\le T}|Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s)|^p\big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] \le C_p(1+E\|\Gamma_t\|^p), \tag{3.4}$$

$$E\Big[\sup_{t\le s\le r}|Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(s)-Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(t)|^p\big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] \le C_p E\big(1+\|\Gamma_t\|^p\big)(r-t)^{\frac{p}{2}}. \tag{3.5}$$

Being particular interested in the case of a deterministic Γ_t, i.e. $\Gamma_t = \gamma_t \in \Lambda_t$:

$$\begin{cases} X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) = \gamma_t(s), & \text{all } \omega, 0 \le s < t, \\ X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) = \gamma_t(t) + \int_t^s b(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr + \int_t^s \sigma(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dW(r), & \text{a.e.-}\omega, \text{ all } t \le s \le T. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) &= g(X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}) + \int_s^T f(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r), Z^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r), \alpha(r))dr \\ &\quad - \int_s^T Z^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r)dW(r), \quad a.e.P, \text{ all } s \in [t,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Given the control process $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, we introduce the following cost functional:

$$J(\gamma_t, \alpha(\cdot)) := Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(t), \quad \text{P-a.s.} \quad \forall \gamma_t \in \Lambda.$$

We define the value functional of the optimal control

$$\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \quad \forall \gamma_t \in \Lambda. \tag{3.8}$$

We can easily prove that for any $t \in [0,T]$ and $\Gamma_t \in L^2(\Omega, \Lambda_t; \mathcal{F}_t/\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$,

$$J(\Gamma_t, \alpha(\cdot)) = Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}(t), \quad \text{P-a.s..}$$

Remark 3.3. (1) Here the essential supremum should be understood as one with respect to indexed families of random variables (see Karatzas and Shreve [21, Appendix A] for details). For the convenience of reader we recall the notion of esssup of random variables. Given a family of real-valued random variables η_α, $\alpha \in I$, a random variable η is said to be $\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\alpha \in I} \eta_\alpha$, if

1. $\eta \le \eta_\alpha$, P-a.s., for any $\alpha \in I$;
2. if there is another random variable ξ such that $\xi \le \eta_\alpha$, P-a.s., for any $\alpha \in I$, then $\xi \le \eta$, P-a.s..

The existence of $\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\alpha\in I}\eta_\alpha$is well known.

(2) Under assumption (H1), the random variable $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable and $L^p(\Omega)$ integrable variable. $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)$ turns out to be deterministic. We have

Proposition 3.4. *The value functional $\tilde{u}$ is deterministic.*

Proof. Firstly we show that there exist $\{\alpha_n(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}}Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\nearrow Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_n}. \tag{3.9}$$

By Theorem A.3 in [21], it is sufficient to prove that, for any $\alpha_1(\cdot)$, $\alpha_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, there exists $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$ such that

$$Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_1}\vee Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_2}=Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha},\quad P\text{-a.e..} \tag{3.10}$$

Actually let $\alpha(s):=\alpha_1(s)\mathbf{1}_{A_1}+\alpha_2(s)\mathbf{1}_{A_2}$, $s\in[t,T]$, where $A_1:=\{Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_1}>Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_2}\}$ and $A_2:=\{Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_1}\leq Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_2}\}$. The fact $\sum_{i=1,2}\varphi(x_i)\mathbf{1}_{A_i}=\sum_{i=1,2}\varphi(x_i\mathbf{1}_{A_i})$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}X^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i}(s)=\gamma(t)&+\int_t^s b(\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i},\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}\alpha_i(r))dr\\&+\int_t^s\sigma(\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i},\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}\alpha_i(r))dW(r),\quad t\leq s\leq T,\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i}(s)=&\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}g(X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i})\\&+\int_s^T f(\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i},\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i}(r),\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}Z^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i}(r),\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}\alpha_i(r))dr\\&-\int_s^T\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}Z^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i}(r)dW(r),\quad s\in[t,T].\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

By the uniqueness of solution of BSDE, we have

$$Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}=\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i},\quad P\text{- a.e..} \tag{3.13}$$

hence by the Lemma 2.12, we conclude $\sum_{i=1,2}\mathbf{1}_{A_i}Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_i}=Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_1}\vee Y_t^{\gamma_t,\alpha_2}$ which yields (3.10).

Suppose $\{\alpha_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\in\mathcal{U}$ such that (3.9) holds. For $Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}$ is continuous about $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, without lost of generality we suppose $\alpha_i(\cdot)$ are of the following form

$$\alpha_i(s)=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\mathbf{1}_{A_{i,j}}\alpha_{ij}(s),\quad s\in[t,T]$$

here $\alpha_{ij}(s)\in\mathcal{F}_s^t$, $t\leq s\leq T$ and $\{A_{ij}\}_{j=1}^N\subset\mathcal{F}_t$ is a partition of $(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t)$, i.e., $\cup_{i=1}^N A_i=\Omega$ and $A_i\cap A_j=\emptyset$, $i\neq j$. Like (3.11) and (3.12), we know that

$$J(\gamma_t,\alpha_i(\cdot))=\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}}J(\gamma_t,\alpha_{ij}(\cdot)).$$

It is easy to prove $J(\gamma_t,\alpha_{ij}(\cdot))$ is deterministic, without lost of generality, we suppose

$$J(\gamma_t,\alpha_{ij}(\cdot))\leq J(\gamma_t,\alpha_{i1}(\cdot)),$$

immediately we have $J(\gamma_t,\alpha_i(\cdot))\leq J(\gamma_t,\alpha_{i1}(\cdot))$, combining (3.9) we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}J(\gamma_t,\alpha_{i1}(\cdot))=\tilde{u}(\gamma_t).$$

Now we conclude that $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)$ is deterministic. □

The following proposition on functional $\tilde{u}$ is an immediate consequence of (3.3) and (3.4):

Lemma 3.5. *There exists a constant $C>0$ such that, for all $0\leq t\leq T$, $\gamma_t,\gamma_t^{'}\in\Lambda_t$,*

$$\begin{array}{lll}(1) & |\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)-\tilde{u}(\gamma_t^{'})| & \leq C\|\gamma_t-\gamma_t^{'}\|;\\ (2) & |\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)| & \leq C(1+\|\gamma_t\|).\end{array}$$

Now we discuss DPP for the optimal control problem (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8). For this purpose, we define the family of backward semigroups associated with BSDE (3.7), following the idea of Peng [36].

Given the initial path $\gamma_t\in\Lambda$, a positive number $\delta\leq T-t$, admissible control process $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$ and a real-valued random variable $\eta\in L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_{t+\delta},P;\mathbb{R})$, we put

$$\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{s,t+\delta}[\eta]:=\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s),\quad s\in[t,t+\delta],$$

where the pair $(\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s),\tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s))_{t\leq s\leq t+\delta}$ is the solution of the following BSDE of the time terminal $t+\delta$:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) &= \eta+\int_s^{t+\delta}f(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha},\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r),\tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r),\alpha(r))dr\\ &\quad -\int_s^{t+\delta}\tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r)dW(r),\quad P\,a.e.,\ \text{all } s\in[t,t+\delta],\end{aligned}\tag{3.14}$$

and $X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}$ is the solution of SDE (3.6). Then, obviously, for the solution $(Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s),Z^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s))_{t\leq s\leq T}$ of BSDE (3.7), the uniqueness of the BSDE yields

$$\begin{aligned}J(\gamma_t,\alpha(\cdot))&=\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,T}[g(X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha})]=\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t+\delta}[Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(t+\delta)]\\ &=\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t+\delta}[Y^{X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t+\delta},\alpha}(t+\delta)]=\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t+\delta}[J(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t+\delta},\alpha)].\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.6. *Under assumption (H1), the value functional $\tilde{u}$ obeys the following DDP:*

$$\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t+\delta}[\tilde{u}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t+\delta})]. \tag{3.15}$$

Our proof requires the following lemma

Lemma 3.7. *Let $t \in [0,T]$, $\Gamma_t \in L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t;\Lambda_t,\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$. For any $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, we have*

$$\tilde{u}(\Gamma_t) \geq Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}_t. \tag{3.16}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$ such that

$$\tilde{u}(\Gamma_t) \leq Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}_t + \varepsilon. \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. Since $\tilde{u}$ is continuous about $\gamma_t \in \Lambda_t$ and $Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_t$ is continuous about $(\gamma_t,\alpha(\cdot)) \in \Lambda_t \times \mathcal{U}$, it is sufficient to prove (3.16) for Γ_t and $\alpha(\cdot)$ of the following forms

$$\Gamma_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}_{A_i}\gamma^i_t$$

and

$$\alpha(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}_{A_i}\alpha^i(s), \quad t \leq s \leq T,$$

with N being a positive integer, α^i $\mathcal{F}^t$-adapted, and $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathcal{F}_t$ being a partition of $(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t)$, i.e. $\cup_{i=1}^N A_i = \Omega$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$, $i \neq j$. We have

$$Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} Y^{\gamma^i_t,\alpha^i}_t \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}_{A_i}\tilde{u}(\gamma^i_t) = \tilde{u}(\Gamma_t),$$

which is (3.16).

In a similar way, we prove (3.17). Obviously there exists $\bar{\Gamma}_t \in L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_t;\Lambda_t,\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_t))$ of the form

$$\bar{\Gamma}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{A_i}\gamma^i_t,$$

such that

$$\|\Gamma_t - \bar{\Gamma}_t\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3C},$$

where C is the constant in Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, $\gamma^i_t \in \Lambda_t$ and $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{F}_t$ satisfies $\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i = \Omega$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$, $i \neq j$. By Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we have for any $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, P-a.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} |Y^{\Gamma_t,\alpha}_t - Y^{\bar{\Gamma}_t,\alpha}_t| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \\ |\tilde{u}(\Gamma_t) - \tilde{u}(\bar{\Gamma}_t)| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Then for any γ_t^i, we can choose an $\mathcal{F}^t$-adapted admissible control $\alpha^i(\cdot)$ such that

$$\tilde{u}(\gamma_t^i) \leq Y^{\gamma_t^i,\alpha^i} - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Let

$$\alpha(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \alpha^i(\cdot),$$

combining (3.18)

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{\Gamma_t,\alpha} &\geq -|Y_t^{\Gamma_t,\alpha} - Y_t^{\bar{\Gamma}_t,\alpha}| + Y_t^{\bar{\Gamma}_t,\alpha} \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} Y_t^{\gamma_t^i,\alpha^i} \\ &\geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} (\tilde{u}(\gamma_i^i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}) = -\frac{2}{3}\varepsilon + \tilde{u}(\bar{\Gamma}_t) \\ &\geq \varepsilon + \tilde{u}(\Gamma_t). \end{aligned}$$

This is (3.17). □

Now we prove Theorem 3.6.

Proof. On one hand,

$$\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{G}_{t,T}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}[g(X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha})] = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{G}_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}[Y_{t+\delta}^{X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha},\alpha}],$$

by (3.16) and the definition of $\tilde{u}$, we have

$$\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{G}_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}[\tilde{u}(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha})].$$

On the other hand, by (3.17) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that, a.e. P

$$\tilde{u}(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}) \leq Y_{t+\delta}^{X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha},\bar{\alpha}} + \varepsilon.$$

The comparison Lemma 2.12 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(\gamma_t) &\geq \sup_{\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{G}_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}[\tilde{u}(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}) - \varepsilon] \\ &\geq \sup_{\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{G}_{t,t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}[\tilde{u}(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t,\alpha})] - C\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The arbitrary of ε guarantees (3.15). □

In Lemma 3.5, the value functional $\tilde{u}$ is Lipschitz continuous in Λ_t, uniformly in t. As a consequence of Theorem 3.6, it has the following continuity in t.

Lemma 3.8. *Under assumption (H1), there is a constant* C *such that, for every* $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$, $t, t' \in [0,T]$,

$$|\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) - \tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'})| \leq (1 + \|\gamma_{t\vee t'}\|)(t-t')^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. Let us suppose $0 \leq t \leq t' \leq T$. According to DPP we know that, for any ε there exists $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that

$$|\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) - \mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t'}[\tilde{u}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t'})]| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence

$$|\tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'}) - \tilde{u}(\gamma_t)| \leq I + II + \varepsilon,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= E|\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t'}[\tilde{u}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t'})] - \mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t'}[\tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'})]|,\\ II &= E|\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t'}[\tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'})] - \tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'})|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, and noting that $\tilde{u}$ is uniformly continuous about γ_t, we have

$$I \leq C(E\big|\tilde{u}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t'}) - \tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'})\big|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(E\|X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t'} - \gamma_{t'}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(1+\|\gamma_{t'}\|)(t'-t)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

here C is independent of $\alpha(\cdot)$. By the definition of $\mathbb{G}^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{t,t'}$, we rewrite II as

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \big|E\big[\tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'}) + \int_t^{t'} f(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r, Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r), Z^{\gamma_t\alpha}(r), \alpha(r))dr \\ &\quad + \int Z^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r)dW(r)\big] - \tilde{u}(\gamma_{t'})\big| \\ &= E\big[\int_t^{t'} \big|f(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r, Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r), Z^{\gamma_t\alpha}(r))\big|dr\big] \\ &\leq C(1+\|\gamma_{t'}\|)(t'-t)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we have leads to (3.19). □

Combining Lemmas 3.5 and 3.8, we have the regularity for the value functional $\tilde{u}$.

Theorem 3.9. *Let assumption (H1) be satisfied. There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for any* $0 \leq t \leq t' \leq T$, $\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'} \in \Lambda$ *we have*

$$|\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) - \tilde{u}(\gamma'_{t'})| \leq C\big(\|\gamma_{t,t'} - \gamma'_{t'}\| + (1 + \|\gamma'_{t'}\| + \|\gamma_t\|)(t'-t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big).$$

4 Associated path-dependent HJB equation

4.1 Path-dependent HJB equation and viscosity solution

Define Hamiltonian $h : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&h(\gamma_t, r, p, A, \alpha) := \\ &\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\sigma\sigma^T(\gamma_t,\alpha)A\big) + b(\gamma_t,\alpha)\cdot p + f(\gamma_t, r, \sigma(\gamma_t,\alpha)^T p, \alpha).\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Consider the following path-dependent HJB equation:

$$-D_t u(\gamma_t) - \sup_{\alpha\in U} h(\gamma_t, u(\gamma_t), D_x u(\gamma_t), D_{xx} u(\gamma_t), \alpha) = 0, \qquad \gamma_t \in \Lambda, t < T, \tag{4.2}$$

with the terminal condition

$$u(\gamma_T) = g(\gamma_T), \qquad \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T. \tag{4.3}$$

Where the Note that the derivatives in (4.2) is in the sense of Definition 2.2.

In this section we will prove that the value functional $\tilde{u}$ defined by (3.8) is a viscosity solution of PHJB equation (4.2).

Definition 4.1. (Classical solution). A functional $u \in C^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ is called a classical solution to PHJB equation (4.2) if it satisfies PHJB equation (4.2) point-wisely.

Remark 4.2. PPDEs are associated to backward SDEs in Peng and Wang [39], where the existence and uniqueness are given for semi-linear PPDEs under rather strong smoothness conditions on the coefficients, the nonlinear source, and the terminal value.

We introduce the notions of semijets analogous to classical cases (see Crandall, Ishii, and Lions [9]). For any $u \in C(\Lambda)$ and $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, $t < T$, define the superjet of u at γ_t:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{J}^+(\gamma_t; u) := \\ &\big\{\psi \in C^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\gamma_t}) : \text{ there exists } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_+^{\gamma_t} \text{ such that, for any } \bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda^{\gamma_t} \text{ and} \\ &s \in [t, \tau(\bar{\gamma})], 0 = \psi(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) \le \psi(\bar{\gamma}_s) - u(\bar{\gamma}_s)\big\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

and the subjet of u at γ_t:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{J}^-(\gamma_t; u) := \\ &\big\{\psi \in C^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\gamma_t}) : \text{ there exists } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_+^{\gamma_t} \text{ such that, for any } \bar{\gamma}_s \in \Lambda^{\gamma_t} \text{ and} \\ &s \in [t, \tau(\bar{\gamma})], 0 = \psi(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) \ge \psi(\bar{\gamma}_s) - u(\bar{\gamma}_s)\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Remark 4.3. (i) In contrast to [14], our definitions do not involve any nonlinear probability.

(ii) In general, $\mathcal{J}^+(\gamma_t;u)$ and $\mathcal{J}^-(\gamma_t;u)$ are disjoint, and they may be empty.

(iii) For the help of localizing technique, for any $\psi\in\mathcal{J}^+(t,\gamma;u)$(respect., $\psi\in\mathcal{J}^-(t,\gamma;u)$), we can choose $\tau\in\mathcal{T}_+^{\gamma_t}$ such that (4.4)(respect., (4.5)) is satisfied $\psi\in C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\gamma_t}(\tau))$. In fact, for a positive number $M>0$, let $\tau^M(\bar\gamma):=\inf\{s>t:|D_t\psi(\bar\gamma_s)|\wedge_{|\alpha|=0,1,2}|D_x^\alpha\psi(\bar\gamma_s)|\geq M\}$ and let τ be the stopping time in (4.4) (respect. (4.5)), then $\tau^M\wedge\tau$ such that ψ satisfies the condition in (4.4) (respect. (4.5)) and $\psi\in C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\gamma_t}(\tau^M\wedge\tau))$.

Now we define the notions of viscosity solutions.

Definition 4.4. Let $u\in C(\Lambda)$.

(i) We say u is a viscosity sub-solution of PHJB equation (4.2) if,

$$-D_t\psi(\gamma_t)-\sup_{\alpha\in U}h(\gamma_t,\psi(\gamma_t),D_x\psi(\gamma_t),D_{xx}\psi(\gamma_t),\alpha)\leq 0,\quad \forall\psi\in\mathcal{J}^+(\gamma_t;u),\gamma_t\in\Lambda,t<T. \tag{4.6}$$

(ii) We say u is a viscosity super-solution of PHJB equation (4.2) if,

$$-D_t\psi(\gamma_t)-\sup_{\alpha\in U}h(\gamma_t,\psi(\gamma_t),D_x\psi(\gamma_t),D_{xx}\psi(\gamma_t),\alpha)\geq 0,\quad \forall\psi\in\mathcal{J}^-(\gamma_t;u),\gamma_t\in\Lambda,t<T. \tag{4.7}$$

(iii) We say u is a viscosity solution of PHJB equation (4.2) if u is both a viscosity sub- and super-solution.

Remark 4.5. A viscosity solution of PHJB equation u is a classical solution if it furthermore lies in $C^{1,2}(\Lambda)$.

4.2 Existence of viscosity solutions

Now we give the solution of PHJB equation (4.2) with the help of FBSDEs (3.6) and (3.7).

Theorem 4.6. *Let assumption (H1) be satisfied. Then $\tilde u$ defined by* (3.8) *is a viscosity solution of PHJB equation* (4.2).

Proof. Firstly, we show that $\tilde u$ is a viscosity sub-solution. Let $\gamma_t\in\Lambda$ and $\varphi\in\mathcal{J}^+(\gamma_t;\tilde u)$ be fixed, then there exists a $\tau\in\mathcal{T}_+^{\gamma_t}$ such that $\varphi\in C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\gamma_t}(\tau))$. Consider the first exiting $\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_t}$-time from the centered ball of radius $M>\|\gamma_t\|$ in $\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}$, i.e. $\{\gamma'_T\in\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}:\|\gamma'_T\|\leq M\}$:

$$\tau^M(\gamma'_T):=\inf\{s>t:\|\gamma'_s\|>M\},\quad\forall\gamma'_T\in\Lambda_T^{\gamma_t}.$$

For any $\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$, define the $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping time

$$\hat\tau^{M,\alpha,\delta}:=\tau(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha})\wedge\tau^M(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha})\wedge(t+\delta). \tag{4.8}$$

Applying the functional Itô formula (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)=\varphi(\gamma_t)=\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}})+\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}}-\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))dr \\ +\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\gamma_t,\delta}} f(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r),\sigma(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))D_x\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r),\alpha(r))dr \\ -\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\gamma_t,\delta}}\left[D_x\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r)\right]^T\sigma(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))dW(r),\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}(\bar{\gamma}_s,\alpha):=D_t\varphi(\bar{\gamma}_t)+h(\bar{\gamma}_t,\varphi(\bar{\gamma}_t),D_x\varphi(\bar{\gamma}_t),D_{xx}\varphi(\bar{\gamma}_t),\alpha),\quad\forall(\bar{\gamma}_s,\alpha)\in\Lambda\times U.$$

Let $(Y^{1,\alpha(\cdot),\delta},Z^{1,\alpha(\cdot),\delta})$ be the solution of the following BSDE

$$\begin{cases}-dY^{1,\alpha,\delta}(r)= & f(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,Y^{1,\alpha,\delta}(r),Z^{1,\alpha,\delta}(r),\alpha(r))dr \\ & -Z^{1,\alpha,\delta}(r)dW(r),\quad r\in[t,\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}]; \\ Y^{1,\alpha,\delta}(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta})= & \tilde{u}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}}).\end{cases}\tag{4.10}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned}\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(s)&:=\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_s)-Y^{1,\alpha,\delta}(s),\\ \delta Z^{\alpha,\delta}(s)&:=\sigma(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_s,\alpha(s))^TD_x\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha,\delta}_s)-Z^{1,\alpha,\delta}(s).\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

Comparing (4.9) and (4.10), we have for $r\in[t,\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}]$, P-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}-d\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(r)&=\Big[-\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))\\ &\quad+f(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r),\sigma(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))^TD_x\varphi(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r),\alpha(r))\\ &\quad-f(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,Y^{1,\alpha,\delta}(r),Z^{1,\alpha,\delta}(r),\alpha(r))\Big]\,dr-\delta Z(r)\,dW(r)\\ &=\Big[-\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))+A(r)\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(r)+\langle\bar{A},\delta Z^{\alpha,\delta}\rangle(r)\Big]\,dr\\ &\quad-\delta Z^{\alpha,\delta}(r)\,dW(r),\end{aligned}\tag{4.12}$$

where $|A|,|\bar{A}|\leq L$ (L is the Lipschitz constant of f, which does not depend on $\alpha(\cdot)$ and δ though A and $\bar{A}$ depend on $\alpha(\cdot)$ and δ). The solution of linear BSDE can be represented as follows (see [18, Proposition 2.2]):

$$\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(t)=E\left[\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta})\Gamma^t(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta})-\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}}\Gamma^t(r)\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}_r,\alpha(r))dr\right],\tag{4.13}$$

where $\Gamma^t(r)$ is the adjoint process defined on $s \in [t, \hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}]$ by the forward linear SDE

$$d\Gamma^t(s) = \Gamma^t(s)\Big(A(s)ds + \bar{A}(s)dW(s)\Big), \quad \Gamma^t(t) = 1,$$

Obviously, $\Gamma^t \geq 0$. Since $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^+(\gamma_t, \tilde{u})$, in view of Definition 4.4 and Theorem 3.6, we have

$$\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}) \geq 0, \quad \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} \delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(t) = 0. \tag{4.14}$$

Hence taking $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}}$ on both sides of equation (4.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E[\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(t)] \\
&= \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E\big[\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta})\Gamma^t(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}) - \int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} \Gamma^t(r)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr\big] \\
&\geq -\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} \Gamma^t(r)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr\big] \\
&= -\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} \Big\{E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha(r))dr\big] \\
&+ E\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} [\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r)) - \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha(r))]dr \\
&+ E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} (\Gamma^t(r) - 1)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr\big]\Big\} \\
&\geq -\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha(r))dr\big] + \\
&- \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} [\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r)) - \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha(r))]dr \\
&- \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} (\Gamma^t(r) - 1)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr\big] \\
&:= -\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} I - \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} II - \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} III.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} I &\leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t) \sup_{\beta\in U} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \beta)] \\
&\leq \sup_{\beta\in U} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \beta) \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Now we estimate higher order terms II and III. For any $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, the definition of stopping $\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}$ in (4.8) implies the boundedness on $[t, \tau^{M,\alpha,\delta}]$ of the terms $b(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))$, $\sigma(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))$, $D_x^i\varphi(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))$ with $i = 0, 1, 2$, and $D_t\varphi(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}(r))$ in $\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))$. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))$ is bounded on $[t, \tau^{M,\alpha,\delta}]$. In view of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\big[\sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(r) - \gamma(t)|^2\big] &\le CE[\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t],\\
E\big[\sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |\Gamma^{t,\alpha}(r) - 1|^2\big] &\le CE[\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t],
\end{aligned}
$$

which, combined with the Lipschitz continuity of b, σ and f and calculating carefully, furthermore imply

$$
E\big[\sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r)) - \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha(r))|^2\big] \le CE[\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t],
$$

with the constant C being independent of $\alpha(\cdot)$ and δ. Applying Hölder inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|II| &\le E\Big[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t) \sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r)) - \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \hat{\alpha})|\Big]\\
&\le [E(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} E\Big[\sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}} |\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r)) - \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \hat{\alpha})|^2\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\le C[E(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} [E(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad (4.17)\\
&\le C[E(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)\delta]^{\frac{1}{2}} [E(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\le C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} E[\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t],
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
|III| &\le CE\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |\Gamma^t(r) - 1| dr \le CE\big[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta} - t) \sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |\Gamma^t(r) - 1|\big]\\
&\le C(E(\hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta} - t)]^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} E\big[\sup_{t\le r\le \hat{\tau}^{M,\hat{\alpha},\delta}} |\Gamma^t(r) - 1|^2\big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad (4.18)\\
&\le C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} E[\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t].
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting (4.16), (4.17) and (4.18) into (4.15), we have

$$
0 \le \big(\sup_{\alpha\in U} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha) + C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\big) \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)]. \qquad (4.19)
$$

For every $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$
E[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)] > 0, \quad \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} E[(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta} - t)] > 0.
$$

Therefore,

$$0 \le \big(\sup_{\alpha \in U} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha) + C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \big).$$

Taking $\delta \to 0$, we have

$$0 \le \sup_{\alpha \in U} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha),$$

which shows that $\tilde{u}$ is a viscosity sub-solution of PHJB equation (4.2).

It remains to prove that $\tilde{u}$ is the viscosity super-solution. For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^-(\gamma_t, \tilde{u})$, we define $\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}$ in a similar way of (4.12), but instead of (4.14), we have

$$\delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(\hat{\tau}^{M,\alpha,\delta}) \le 0,\ \forall \alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}; \quad \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}} \delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(t) = 0.$$

Combining (4.12), we have for any $\bar{\alpha} \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}} \delta Y^{\alpha,\delta}(t) \le \delta Y^{\bar{\alpha},\delta}(t) \\
&= E\big[\delta Y^{\bar{\alpha},\delta}(\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta})\Gamma^t(\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta}) - \int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta}} \Gamma^t(r)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha})dr\big] \\
&\le -E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta}} \Gamma^t(r)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha})dr\big] \\
&= -E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta}} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \bar{\alpha})dr\big] + E\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta}} [\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha}) - \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \bar{\alpha})]dr \\
&+ E\big[\int_t^{\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta}} (\Gamma^t(r) - 1)\mathcal{L}(X_r^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha})dr\big] \\
&\le -\mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \bar{\alpha})E[\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta} - t] + C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}E[\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta} - t],
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.17) and (4.18). Since $\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta} - t > 0$, P-a.s., we have

$$E[\hat{\tau}^{M,\bar{\alpha},\delta} - t] > 0,$$

and then

$$\mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \bar{\alpha}) \le C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Setting $\delta \to 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \bar{\alpha}) \le 0, \quad \forall \bar{\alpha} \in U,$$

which implies

$$\sup_{\alpha \in U} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_t, \alpha) \le 0.$$

Hence $\tilde{u}$ is a super-solution of PHJBE (4.2). We complete the proof. □

Remark 4.7. The value functional $\tilde{u}$ can be defined on the larger space $\hat{\Lambda}$, and so is the PHJB equation (4.2). We can prove Theorem 4.6 holds on the space $\hat{\Lambda}$ using slightly different argument.

Example 4.8. We will show that the well known common stochastic optimal control problem could be viewed as a special form of (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8), and under the smooth condition the corresponding PHJB equation is associated to a backward stochastic HJB equation.

Let $\{B_t\}_{0\leq t\leq T}$ be a $d-$dimensional Winner process under measure space $(\Omega := \Lambda_T^d, P_0)$. It is well known that the familiar non-Markovian stochastic optimal control problem is of the following form, for any $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, define the forward backward stochastic differential system:

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}^{t,x,\alpha}(s) & = \bar{b}(B_s, \bar{X}^{t,x,\alpha}(s), \alpha(s))ds + \bar{\sigma}(B_s, \bar{X}^{t,x,\alpha}(s), \alpha(s))dB(s), \quad t \leq s \leq T, \\ \bar{X}^{t,x,\alpha}(t) & = x, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} -d\bar{Y}^{t,x,\alpha}(s) & = \bar{f}(B_s, x, \bar{Y}^{t,x,\alpha}(s), \bar{Z}^{t,x,\alpha}(s), \alpha(s))ds - \bar{Z}^{t,x,\alpha}(s)dB(s), \quad t \leq s \leq T, \\ \bar{Y}^{t,x,\alpha}(T) & = \bar{g}(B_T, \bar{X}^{t,x,\alpha}(T)), \end{cases}$$

with $\bar{b} : \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{\sigma} : \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, $\bar{f} : \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{g} : \Lambda_T^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. The optimal value field $\bar{u} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\bar{u}(t,x) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)} \bar{Y}^{t,x,\alpha}(t).$$

This problem is path dependent on B_t and state dependent on $X(t)$. Now we transform this problem into the path dependent case. For any $(\gamma_t, \xi_t) \in \Lambda^d \times \Lambda^n$, $\alpha \in U$, let us define $b : \Lambda^{d+n} \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{d+n}$, $\sigma : \Lambda^{d+n} \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{(d+n)\times d}$, $f : \Lambda^{d+n} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \Lambda_T^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} b\Big((\gamma_t, \xi_t), \alpha\Big) &:= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \bar{b}(\gamma_t, \xi_t(t), \alpha) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \sigma\Big((\gamma_t, \xi_t), \alpha\Big) &:= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} \\ \bar{\sigma}(\gamma_t, \xi_t(t), \alpha) \end{pmatrix}, \\ f\Big(\gamma_t, \xi_t, y, z, \alpha\Big) &:= \bar{f}(\gamma_t, \xi_t(t), y, z, \alpha), \\ g(\gamma_T, \xi_T) &:= \bar{g}(\gamma_T, \xi(T)). \end{aligned}$$

Following (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8), for any $(\gamma_t, \xi_t) \in \Lambda^d \times \Lambda^n$ and $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$ we can define $X^{(\gamma_t,\xi_t),\alpha}$, $Y^{(\gamma_t,\xi_t),\alpha}$ and $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t, \xi_t) := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} Y^{(\gamma_t,\xi_t),\alpha}(t)$. Note that $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t, \xi_t)$ only depends on the state $x = \xi_t(t)$ of the path ξ_t at time t—instead of its whole history up to time t, and thus we can rewrite $X^{(\gamma_t,\xi_t),\alpha}$, $Y^{(\gamma_t,\xi_t),\alpha}$, and $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t,\xi_t)$ into $X^{\gamma_t,x,\alpha}$, $Y^{\gamma_t,x,\alpha}$, and $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t,x)$, respectively. The uniqueness of solution for the FBSDE leads, for any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}^{t,x,\alpha}(s)&=X^{B_t,x,\alpha}(s),\quad \text{a.e. } P,\quad t\le s\le T,\\ \bar{Y}^{t,x,\alpha}(s)&=Y^{B_t,x,\alpha}(s),\quad \text{a.e. } P,\quad t\le s\le T,\\ \bar{u}(t,x)&=\tilde{u}(B_t,x),\quad \text{a.e. } P,\quad t\le s\le T.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, in view of Theorem 4.6, $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t,x)$ is a solution to the PDE:

$$\begin{aligned}&-D_t\tilde{u}-\sup_{\alpha\in U}\Big[\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\sigma\sigma^T(\gamma_t,x,\alpha)\partial_{xx}\tilde{u}\big)+b(\gamma_t,x,\alpha)\cdot\partial_x\tilde{u}+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}D_{\gamma\gamma}\tilde{u}\\ &+\sigma(\gamma_t,x,\alpha)^TD_{x\gamma}\tilde{u}+f(\gamma_t,x,u,D_\gamma\tilde{u}+\sigma(\gamma_t,x,\alpha)^T\partial_x\tilde{u},\alpha)\Big]=0,\quad (\gamma_t,x)\in\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n.\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

Here, D_γ and $D_{\gamma\gamma}$ are the path vertical derivatives in $\gamma_t\in\Lambda^d$, and ∂_x and ∂_{xx} are the classical partial derivatives in the state variable x.

If $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t,x)$ is smooth enough, applying Itô formula to $\tilde{u}(B_t,x)$, we have

$$d\tilde{u}(B_t,x)=(D_t\tilde{u}(B_t,x)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}D_{\gamma\gamma}\tilde{u}(B_t,x))dt+D_\gamma\tilde{u}(B_t,x)dB(t),$$

for the expression of D_t in (4.20), it leads to

$$\begin{aligned}d\tilde{u}(B_t,x)=-\sup_{\alpha\in U}\big[&\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\sigma\sigma^T(B_t,x,\alpha)\partial_{xx}\tilde{u}\big)+b(B_t,x,\alpha)\cdot\partial_x\tilde{u}\\ &\sigma(B_t,x,\alpha)^TD_{x\gamma}\tilde{u}+f(B_t,x,u,D_\gamma\tilde{u}+\sigma(B_t,x,\alpha)^T\partial_x\tilde{u},\alpha)\big]dt\\ &+D_\gamma\tilde{u}(B_t,x)dB(t).\end{aligned}$$

Define the $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted process $p(t,x)=D_\gamma\tilde{u}(B_t,x)$, we have that $\bar{u}(t,x)=\tilde{u}(B_t,x)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}d\bar{u}(t,x)=-\sup_{\alpha\in U}\Big\{&\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\sigma\sigma^T(B_t,x,\alpha)\partial_{xx}\bar{u}\big)+b(B_t,x,\alpha)\cdot\partial_x\bar{u}\\ &\sigma(B_t,x,\alpha)^T\partial_xp+f(B_t,x,u,p+\sigma(B_t,x,\alpha)^T\partial_x\bar{u},\alpha)\Big\}dt\\ &+p\,dB(t),\end{aligned}\tag{4.21}$$

with the terminal condition

$$\bar{u}(T,x)=g(B_T,x).\tag{4.22}$$

The fully nonlinear BSPDE of form (4.21) and (4.22) is the stochastic HJB equation introduced by Peng [35, 36].

5 Uniqueness of viscosity solution

In this section, we show the main result of this paper, the uniqueness of the viscosity solution for path-dependent HJB equations. We discuss both non-degenerate and degenerate cases.

5.1 Non-degenerate case

Except for adding the non-degenerate condition, we extend (H1) by defining the coefficients on $\hat{\Lambda}$ for the convenience. We make the following assumption.

(H2) *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that, for all* $(t, \gamma_T, y, z, \alpha)$, $(t', \gamma'_T, y', z', \alpha') \in [0, T] \times \hat{\Lambda}_T \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$, *the following functionals* $b : \hat{\Lambda} \times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : \hat{\Lambda} \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, $g : \hat{\Lambda}_T \to \mathbb{R}$, *and* $f : \hat{\Lambda} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfy the following conditions:*

$$\begin{aligned}|b(\gamma_t, \alpha) - b(\gamma'_{t'}, \alpha')| &\le C(d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'}) + |\alpha - \alpha'|),\\ |\sigma(\gamma_t, \alpha) - \sigma(\gamma'_{t'}, \alpha')| &\le C(d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'}) + |\alpha - \alpha'|),\\ |f(\gamma_t, y, z, \alpha) - f(\gamma'_{t'}, y', z', \alpha')| &\le C(d_\infty(\gamma_t, \gamma'_{t'}) + |y - y'| + |z - z'| + |\alpha - \alpha'|),\\ |g(\gamma_T) - g(\gamma'_T)| &\le C\|\gamma_T - \gamma'_T\|.\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Moreover, $b, \sigma, g,$ *and* f *are bounded, and*

$$\sigma\sigma^T \quad > \quad \frac{1}{C} I_n. \tag{5.2}$$

.

The uniqueness of viscosity solutions of (4.2) is an immediate consequence of the following representation theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *(Representation Theorem) Suppose that (H2) holds. Let* $u \in C_b(\Lambda)$ *be a viscosity solution of* (4.2). *Then* u *is the value functional* $\tilde{u}$ *defined by* (3.8).

In view of the comparison theorem of BSDEs, we immediately have the following comparison theorem.

Corollary 5.2. *(Comparison Theorem) Assume (H2). Let* $u_1, u_2 \in C_b(\Lambda)$, $g_1, g_2 \in C_b(\Lambda_T)$, $g_1 \le g_2$. *Furthermore, let* u_1 *and* u_2 *be viscosity solutions of PHJB equation* (4.2), *satisfying the terminal condition: for any* $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$

$$\begin{aligned}u_1(\gamma_T) &= g_1(\gamma_T),\\ u_2(\gamma_T) &= g_2(\gamma_T).\end{aligned}$$

Then $u_1 \le u_2$.

Theorem 5.1 will be proved.

Assume without loss of generality that, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that, for all $(\gamma_t, p, A, \alpha) \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \times U$ and $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}(r_1 < r_2)$,

$$h(\gamma_t, r_1, p, A, \alpha) - h(\gamma_t, r_2, p, A, \alpha) \geq C(r_2 - r_1). \tag{5.3}$$

Otherwise, define $\bar{u}(\gamma_t) = e^{-\lambda t} u(\gamma_t)$ for $\lambda > 0$. Then u is a viscosity solution of PHJB equation (4.2) if and only if $\hat{u}$ is a viscosity solution of the following PPDE

$$\begin{cases} -D_t\bar{u} - \sup_{\alpha\in U} \bar{h}(\gamma_t, \bar{u}, D\bar{u}, D^2\bar{u}, \alpha) = 0, & \gamma_t \in \Lambda, \\ \bar{u}(\gamma_T) = e^{-\lambda t} g(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\bar{h}(\gamma_t, r, p, A, \alpha) := \lambda r + e^{\lambda t} h(\gamma_t, e^{-\lambda t} r, e^{-\lambda t} p, e^{-\lambda t} A, \alpha).$$

Obviously, $\bar{h}$ satisfies (5.3) for sufficiently large λ.

5.1.1 State-dependent smooth approximations

First, we construct the state-dependent approximations of the path functional $\tilde{u}$. Let m be a positive integer, and $t_i := \frac{i}{m} T, i = 0, 1, \cdots m$, which divide the time interval $[0, T]$ into m equal parts. Now for all $t \in [0, T]$, we define the truncating operator $\mathbb{P}^m : \Lambda_t \to \hat{\Lambda}_t$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^m(\gamma_t)(r) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \gamma(t_i)\mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(r) + \gamma(t_{k-1})\mathbf{1}_{[t_{k-1}, t)}(r) + \gamma(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}}(r) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\gamma(t_i) - \gamma(t_{i-1}))\mathbf{1}_{[t_{i-1}, t]}(r) + (\gamma(t) - \gamma(t_{k-1}))\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}}(r), \end{aligned}$$

with k being a positive integer such that $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$.

We define functions $b^m : \hat{\Lambda} \times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma^m : \hat{\Lambda} \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, $f^m : \hat{\Lambda} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \to \mathbb{R}$, $g^m : \hat{\Lambda}_T \to \mathbb{R}$, and $H^m : \hat{\Lambda} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} b^m(\gamma_t, \alpha) &= b(\mathbf{P}^m(\gamma_t), \alpha), \\ \sigma^m(\gamma_t, \alpha) &= \sigma(\mathbf{P}^m(\gamma_t), \alpha), \\ f^m(\gamma_t, y, z, \alpha) &= f(\mathbf{P}^m(\gamma_t), y, z, \alpha), \\ g^m(\gamma_T) &= g(\mathbf{P}^m(\gamma_T)), \\ h^m(\gamma_t, r, p, A, \alpha) &= h(\mathbf{P}^m(\gamma_t), r, p, A, \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

From assumption (H2), we have the following estimates

$$
\begin{aligned}
|b^m(\gamma_t,\alpha)-b(\gamma_t,\alpha)| &< C\|\mathbf{P}\gamma_t-\gamma_t\|,\\
|\sigma^m(\gamma_t,\alpha)-\sigma(\gamma_t,\alpha)| &< C\|\mathbf{P}\gamma_t-\gamma_t\|,\\
|f^m(\gamma_t,y,z,\alpha)-f(\gamma_t,y,z,\alpha)| &< C\|\mathbf{P}\gamma_t-\gamma_t\|,\\
|g^m(\gamma_t)-g(\gamma_t)| &< C\|\mathbf{P}\gamma_t-\gamma_t\|,\\
|h^m(\gamma_t,r,p,A,\alpha)-h(\gamma_t,r,p,A,\alpha)| &< C\|\mathbf{P}\gamma_t-\gamma_t\|(1+|p|+|A|).
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.4}
$$

For each m and $i=1,\dots,m$, define functions $B^{m,i}:(t_{i-1},t_i]\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}\times U\to\mathbb{R}^n$, $\Sigma^{m,i}:(t_{i-1},t_i]\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}\times U\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, $F^{m,i}:(t_{i-1},t_i]\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times U\to\mathbb{R}$, $G^m:\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\to\mathbb{R}$, and $H^{m,i}:(t_{i-1},t_i]\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\times U\to\mathbb{R}$ as follows (with $\overrightarrow{x_i}=(x_1,\cdots,x_i)\in\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}$):

$$
\begin{aligned}
B^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},\alpha) &= b\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}x_j\mathbf{1}_{[t_j,t]}+x_i\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}},\alpha\Big),\\
\Sigma^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},\alpha) &= \sigma\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}x_j\mathbf{1}_{[t_j,t]}+x_i\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}},\alpha\Big),\\
F^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},y,z,\alpha) &= f\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}x_j\mathbf{1}_{[t_j,t]}+x_i\mathbf{1}_{\{t\}},y,z,\alpha\Big),\\
G^m(x_1,\cdots,x_m) &= g\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}x_j\mathbf{1}_{[t_j,T]}+x_m\mathbf{1}_{\{T\}}\Big),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
H^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},r,p,A,\alpha)=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\Sigma^{m,i}(\Sigma^{m,i})^TA\big)+B^{m,i}\cdot p+F^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},r,(\Sigma^{m,i})^Tp,\alpha).
$$

Obviously, for any $\gamma\in\Lambda_T$, $\alpha\in U$ and $t\in(t_{i-1},t_i]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
b^m(\gamma_t,\alpha) &= B^{m,i}\big(t,\gamma(t_1),\gamma(t_2)-\gamma(t_1),\cdots,\\
&\qquad \gamma(t_{i-1})-\gamma(t_{i-2}),\gamma(t)-\gamma(t_{i-1}),\alpha\big),\\
\sigma^m(\gamma_t,\alpha) &= \Sigma^{m,i}\big(t,\gamma(t_1),\gamma(t_2)-\gamma(t_1),\cdots,\\
&\qquad \gamma(t_{i-1})-\gamma(t_{i-2}),\gamma(t)-\gamma(t_{i-1}),\alpha\big),\\
f^m(\gamma_t,y,z,\alpha) &= F^{m,i}\big(t,\gamma(t_1),\gamma(t_2)-\gamma(t_1),\cdots,\\
&\qquad \gamma(t_{i-1})-\gamma(t_{i-2}),\gamma(t)-\gamma(t_{i-1}),y,z,\alpha\big),\\
g^m(\gamma,\alpha) &= G^{m,i}\big(\gamma(t_1),\gamma(t_2)-\gamma(t_1),\cdots,\\
&\qquad \gamma(T)-\gamma(t_{m-1}),\alpha\big),\\
h^m(\gamma_t,r,p,A,\alpha) &= H^{m,i}\big(t,\gamma(t_1),\gamma(t_2)-\gamma(t_1),\cdots,\\
&\qquad \gamma(t_{i-1})-\gamma(t_{i-2}),\gamma(t)-\gamma(t_{i-1}),r,p,A,\alpha\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, from assumption (H2), $B^{m,i}, \sigma^{m,i}, F^{m,i}$, and G^m are uniformly Lipschitz continuous about $(t, x_0, \cdots, x_i, y, z, \alpha)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} B^{m,i}(t_i, \overrightarrow{x_i}, \alpha) &= B^{m+1,i}(t_i+, \overrightarrow{x_i}, 0, \alpha), \\ \Sigma^{m,i}(t_i, \overrightarrow{x_i}, \alpha) &= \Sigma^{m+1,i}(t_i+, \overrightarrow{x_i}, 0, \alpha), \\ F^{m,i}(t_i, \overrightarrow{x_i}, y, z, \alpha) &= F^{m+1,i}(t_i+, \overrightarrow{x_i}, 0, y, z, \alpha), \\ H^{m,i}(t_i, \overrightarrow{x_i}, r, p, A, \alpha) &= H^{m+1,i}(t_i+, \overrightarrow{x_i}, 0, r, p, A, \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Here $f(t_i+)$ is the right limit of the function f at time t_i.

Consider the following FBSDE:

$$\begin{cases} X^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) = (\mathbf{P}^m \gamma_t)(s), & \text{all } \omega,\ s \in [0,t], \\ X^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) = (\mathbf{P}^m \gamma_t)(t) + \int_t^s b^m(X_r^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr & \\ \qquad + \displaystyle\int_t^s \sigma^m(X_r^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))\, dW(r), & \text{a.e.-}\omega,\ \forall s \in [t,T]; \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) &= g^m(X_T^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}) + \int_s^T f^m(X_r^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}, Y^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha(\cdot)}(r), Z^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(r), \alpha(r))\, dr \\ &\quad - \int_s^T Z^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(r)\, dW(s), \quad s \in [t,T]. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\tilde{u}^m(\gamma_t) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} Y^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(t).$$

Proposition 5.3. *For $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, and $p > 2$, we have the estimate*

$$E\big[\|X_T^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha} - X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p\big] \le C\Big(Osc(\gamma_t, m^{-1})^p + m^{-\frac{p}{2}}\Big), \tag{5.6}$$

$$E\Big[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} |Y^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) - Y^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s)|^p\Big] \le C\Big(Osc(\gamma_t, m^{-1})^p + m^{-\frac{p}{2}}\Big), \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$Osc(\gamma_t, m^{-1}) := \max_{0<s<s+\delta<t, 0<\delta<\frac{1}{m}} |\gamma(s+\delta) - \gamma(s)|$$

is the oscillating amplitude with time m^{-1} of γ_t in the interval $(0,t)$.

Proof. By (5.4),

$$\begin{aligned} & |b^m(X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}) - b(X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha})| \\ \le& C\|\mathbf{P}^m X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha} - X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\| \\ \le& C(\|\mathbf{P}^m X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha} - \mathbf{P}^m X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\| + \|\mathbf{P}^m X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha} - X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|) \\ \le& C(\|X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha} - X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\| + \|\mathbf{P}^m X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha} - X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|). \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, we have

$$|\sigma^m(X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha})-\sigma(X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha})|\leq C(\|X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|+\|\mathbf{P}^m X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|),$$

$$\begin{aligned}&|f^m(X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha},y',z',\alpha)-f(X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha},y,z,\alpha)|\\ \leq& C(\|X_s^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|+\|\mathbf{P}^m X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_s^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|)+|y-y'|+|z-z'|.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô formula, BDG and Gronwall inequality, by the standard argument we have

$$\begin{aligned}E\|X_T^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p&\leq CE\|\mathbf{P}^m X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p\\ &=CE\left[\max_{\substack{1\leq i\leq m\\ t_{i-1}\leq s\leq t_i}}|X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(s)-X^{\gamma_t,\alpha}(t_i)|\right]\\ &\leq C\Big(\mathrm{Osc}(\gamma_t,m^{-1})^p+m^{-\frac{p}{2}}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&E\|Y_T^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}-Y_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p\\ \leq& C\Big(E\|X_T^{m,\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p+E\|\mathbf{P}^m X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}-X_T^{\gamma_t,\alpha}\|^p\Big)\\ \leq& C\Big(\mathrm{Osc}(\gamma_t,m^{-1})^p+m^{-\frac{p}{2}}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

□

Obviously, (5.7) yields, for any $\gamma_t\in\Lambda$, and any positive integer m

$$|\tilde{u}(\gamma_t)-\tilde{u}^m(\gamma_t)|\leq C\Big(\mathrm{Osc}(\gamma_t,m^{-1})+m^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\to 0,\quad m\to\infty. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $\{V^{m,i}\}_{i=1,\cdots m}$ be the unique viscosity solutions of second order parameterized nonlinear parabolic equations

$$\begin{cases}-\partial_t V^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i})-\sup\limits_{\alpha\in U}H^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V^{m,i},\partial_{x_i}V^{m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V^{m,i},\alpha)=0,\\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (t,\overrightarrow{x_i})\in(t_{i-1},t_i)\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n},\ i=1,\cdots,m;\\ V^{m,i}(t_i,\overrightarrow{x_i})=V^{m,i+1}(t_i+,\overrightarrow{x_i},0),\qquad i<m,\ \overrightarrow{x_i}\in\mathbb{R}^{i\times n};\\ V^{m,m}(T,\overrightarrow{x_m})=G^m(\overrightarrow{x_m}),\qquad \overrightarrow{x_m}\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}.\end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

According to the the relationship between viscosity solution of HJB equations and the control problems, we have, for any $\gamma_t \in \Lambda, t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$

$$\tilde{u}^m(\gamma_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \chi_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(t) V^{m,i}(t, \gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2) - \gamma(t_1), \cdots, \gamma(t_{i-1}) - \gamma(t_{i-2}), \gamma(t) - \gamma(t_{i-1})).$$

Second, we construct the smooth approximations of $\tilde{u}^m$. For this purpose, we mollify $\sup_\alpha H^{m,i}$. Consider the following mollifier $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n^2} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be

$$\varphi(t, x, r, p, A) = \begin{cases} C \exp\big(- (1 - (t-1)^2 - |x|^2 - r^2 - |p|^2 - |A|^2)^{-1} \big), \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (t-1)^2 + |x|^2 + r^2 + |p|^2 + |A|^2 < 1; \\ 0, \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad else. \end{cases}$$

where C is the constant such that $\int \varphi = 1$. Let

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t, x, r, p, A) := \varepsilon^{-(n^2+2n+2)} \varphi(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{r}{\varepsilon}, \frac{p}{\varepsilon}, \frac{A}{\varepsilon}).$$

Now we extend $H^{m,i}$ on the interval $t \in [-1, t_{i-1}]$ by

$$H^{m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}, r, p, A, \alpha) := H^{m,i}(t_{i-1}, \overrightarrow{x_i}, r, p, A, \alpha).$$

and mollify $\sup_\alpha H^{m,i}$ on interval $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$ as

$$\hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon(\cdot, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot) := \left(\sup_\alpha H^{m,i}(\cdot, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \alpha) \right) * \varphi_\varepsilon(\cdot), \tag{5.10}$$

where $*$ is the convolution operator about (t, x_i, r, p, A). Obviously, $\hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon$ is differentiable in (t, x_i, r, p, A) and Lipschitz continuous about $(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1})$. Observing the structure carefully, we obtain that

$$|\hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon - \sup_\alpha H^{m,i}| < C(1 + |p| + |A|)\varepsilon, \tag{5.11}$$

and $\hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon$ satisfy the following structure conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_t \hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon| + |\partial_{x_i} \hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon| < C(1 + |p| + |A|), \\ & |\partial_p \hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon| + |\hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}, r, p, 0)| < C, \\ & \frac{1}{C} I_n < (\partial_{j,k} \hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon)_{j,k=1,\cdots n} < C I_n, \\ & \partial_r \hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon < -C, \\ & \hat{H}^{m,i}_\varepsilon \text{ is convex in } A. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Consider the following system of fully nonlinear parameterized state-dependent PDE

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t V_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i}) - \hat{H}_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V_\varepsilon^{m,i},\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{m,i},D_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{m,i}) = 0, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (t,\overrightarrow{x_i}) \in (t_{i-1},t_i)\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}; \\ V_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t_i,\overrightarrow{x_i}) = V_\varepsilon^{m,i+1}(t_i+,\overrightarrow{x_i},0), \qquad i<m,\ \overrightarrow{x_i}\in\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}; \\ V_\varepsilon^{m,m}(T,x_1,\cdots,x_m) = G^m(x_1,\cdots,x_m), \qquad (x_1,\cdots,x_m)\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

By the standard arguments about deterministic PDE, we have following key lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *The system* (5.13) *have unique viscosity solutions* $\{V_\varepsilon^{m,i}\}_{i=1}^m$. *Moreover,* $V_\varepsilon^{m,i}$ *is bounded and Lipschitz continuous about* $\overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}$, *and there is a positive constant* C *which is independent of* m, i, *and* ε, *such that for each* $i=1,\cdots m$ *and each* $\overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}\in\mathbb{R}^{n(i-1)}$, *we have the following:*

(1) $V_\varepsilon^{m,i}(\cdot,\overrightarrow{x_{i-1}},\cdot)$ *is* $C^{1,2}([t_{i-1},t_i)\times\mathbb{R}^n)$, *and*

$$|\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i})| \ < C, \qquad |\partial_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i})| < C. \tag{5.14}$$

(2) smoothly approximating rate:

$$|V_\varepsilon^{m,i} - V^{m,i}| < C\varepsilon, \tag{5.15}$$

Proof. By Perron's method and comparison principle (see [9]), system (5.13) has unique viscosity solutions. It is easy to see that the solutions are bounded and Lipschitz continuous about $\overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}$.

In view of Wang [44, Theorems 1.1 and 1.3], using the interior $C^{1,\alpha}$ and $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for the equations of the structure conditions (5.12) (see Lieberman [23, Chapter 14, Section 2-4]), we have assertion (1).

It remains to show assertion (2). Form (5.14) and (5.11), we see that, when M is sufficiently large, $V_\varepsilon^{m,i}+M\varepsilon$ is a viscosity super-solution and $V_\varepsilon^{m,i}-M\varepsilon$ a viscosity sub-solution of equation (5.9), which imply (5.15) by the comparison principle. □

Now, define

$$\begin{aligned} & u_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(t) V_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t,\gamma_t(t_1),\gamma_t(t_2)-\gamma_t(t_1),\cdots,\gamma_t(t_{i-1})-\gamma_t(t_{i-2}),\gamma_t(t)-\gamma_t(t_{i-1})), \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{h}_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_t,r,p,A) \\ & := \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(t)\hat{H}_\varepsilon^{m,i}(t,\gamma_t(t_1),\gamma_t(t_2)-\gamma_t(t_1),\cdots,\gamma_t(t_{i-1})-\gamma_t(t_{i-2}),\gamma_t(t)-\gamma_t(t_{i-1}),r,p,A). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, u_ε^m is the classical solution of the following path-dependent PDE

$$\begin{cases} -D_t u_\varepsilon^m - \hat{h}_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_t, u_\varepsilon^m, D_x u_\varepsilon^m, D_{xx}^2 u_\varepsilon^m) = 0, & \forall \gamma_t \in \Lambda, 0 < t < T; \\ u_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_T) = G^m(\gamma_T), & \forall \gamma_T \in \Lambda. \end{cases} \tag{5.17}$$

Moreover we have from Lemma (5.4).

Proposition 5.5. *There is a positive constant C, independent of m and ε, such that*
(1)

$$|u_\varepsilon^m - \tilde{u}^m| < C\varepsilon, \tag{5.18}$$

(2) $u_\varepsilon^m \in C^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ and for all $\gamma_t \in \Lambda, t < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |D_x u_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_t)| &< C, \\ |\partial_{xx} u_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_t)| &< C. \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

(5.11) easily yields

$$|\hat{h}_\varepsilon^m - \sup_\alpha h^m| < C(1 + |p| + |A|)\varepsilon. \tag{5.20}$$

Combining (5.8) and (5.18), we directly have for all $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$

$$\lim_{m\to\infty, \varepsilon\to 0} |\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) - u_\varepsilon^m(\gamma_t)| = 0. \tag{5.21}$$

Note that the convergence in (5.21) is not uniform in Λ.

5.1.2 Local maximization of the path functional

In the viscosity solution theory of state-dependent PDE, the uniqueness is usually obtained by the contradiction at the maximum point of the difference of two solutions. It is difficult to find the maximum point inside a domain of Λ, for Λ is not locally compact as an infinite dimensional space. Sharpening an assertion of [14, page 22] concerning the local maximization of (partial) *almost all paths*, we have the following local maximization of *every path*, which is crucial to our subsequent analysis of the smoothing approximations in the next two subsections.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $w \in C_b(\Lambda)$. There exists time map $\tau^* : \Lambda_T \to [0, T]$ such that, for any $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T$,*

$$w(\bar{\gamma}_{\tau^*(\bar{\gamma})}) \geq w(\gamma_s), \qquad \text{for any } \gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_{\tau^*(\bar{\gamma})}}, \tag{5.22}$$

and

$$w(\bar{\gamma}_{\tau^*(\bar{\gamma})}) \geq w(\mathbf{0}). \tag{5.23}$$

Proof. By the theory of optimal stopping (seeing Karatzas and Shreve[21, Appendix D]), there exists at least one optimal stopping $\hat{\tau}$, i.e. $\hat{\tau}$ satisfies

$$P_0[w(B_{\hat{\tau}})] = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} P_0[w(B_\tau)], \tag{5.24}$$

and

$$w(B_{\hat{\tau}}) = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}, \tau \geq \hat{\tau}} P_0[w(B_\tau)|\mathcal{G}^c_{\hat{\tau}}] \qquad \mu \text{ a.e..} \tag{5.25}$$

That is to say, there is a set $A_1 \in \Lambda_T$ with $\mu(A_1) = 0$ such that for each $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T \backslash A_1$, each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\tau \geq \hat{\tau}$,

$$w(\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}) \geq P_0[w(B_\tau)|\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\tau}}](\bar{\gamma}) = P_0^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}[w((B_\tau)^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}})] = P_0^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}\Big[w\Big(B^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}_{\tau^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}}\Big)\Big].$$

For $\tau^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}$ runs through $\mathcal{T}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}$ when τ reads through $\{\tau \in \mathcal{T}; \tau \geq \hat{\tau}\}$, Lemma 5.7 (which will be given below) yields that, for each $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T \backslash A_1$,

$$w(\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}) \geq w(\gamma_s), \qquad \text{for all } \gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})}}.$$

Define $A_2 := \{\gamma \in \Lambda_T; w(B_{\hat{\tau}}) < w(0)\}$. We claim that

$$P_0(A_2) = 0.$$

Otherwise, define

$$\tilde{\tau} := \begin{cases} \hat{\tau}, & \text{on } A_2; \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then $P_0[w(B_{\tilde{\tau}})] > P_0[w(B_{\hat{\tau}})]$ which contradicts that $\hat{\tau}$ is an optimal stopping time.

For the path $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T \backslash (A_1 \cup A_2)$, let $\tau^*(\bar{\gamma}) := \hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma})$, the definitions of A_1 and A_2 immediately yield that (5.22) and (5.23) hold true.

For the path $\bar{\gamma} \in A_1 \cup A_2$, there exists a sequence $\{\bar{\gamma}^m\}_{m=1,2,\cdots} \subset \Lambda_T \backslash (A_1 \cup A_2)$ such that

$$d_\infty(\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}^m) \to 0, \qquad m \to \infty, \tag{5.26}$$

because of $\mu(A_1 \cup A_2) = 0$. We choose a subsequence of $\{\bar{\gamma}^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ (still denoted $\{\bar{\gamma}^m\}$) such that $\{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)\}$ converges. Define

$$\tau^*(\bar{\gamma}) := \lim_{m \to \infty} \hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m). \tag{5.27}$$

We should remark here, $\tau^*(\bar{\gamma})$ in (5.27) will be different if the choice of $\{\bar{\gamma}^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is different, but this dose not impact the conclusion.

(5.26) and (5.27) show that, for any $\gamma \in \Lambda_T$, $s \in [t, T]$,

$$d_\infty(\bar{\gamma}_{\tau^*(\bar{\gamma})}, \bar{\gamma}^m_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)}) \to 0, \qquad m \to \infty,$$
$$d_\infty(\gamma_s^{\bar{\gamma}_{\tau^*(\bar{\tau})}}, \gamma_s^{\bar{\gamma}^m_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)}}) \to 0, \qquad m \to \infty.$$

$\bar{\gamma}^m$ and $\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &w(\bar{\gamma}^m_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)}) \geq w(\gamma_s^{\bar{\gamma}^m_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)}}), \qquad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Lambda_T, \hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}) \leq s \leq T, \\ &w(\bar{\gamma}^m_{\hat{\tau}(\bar{\gamma}^m)}) \geq w(\mathbf{0}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $m \to \infty$, the continuity of w concludes that (5.22) and (5.23) hold true at γ_t for τ^* defined by (5.27). ☐

The following lemma has been used in the preceding proof.

Lemma 5.7. *Let* $w \in C_b(\Lambda)$. *If*

$$w(\mathbf{0}) \geq P_0[w(B_\tau)], \qquad \textit{for all } \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{5.28}$$

then

$$w(\mathbf{0}) \geq w(\gamma_t), \qquad \textit{for all } \gamma_t \in \Lambda. \tag{5.29}$$

Proof. We prove this lemma by contradiction. Suppose (5.29) does not hold, in other word, there exists $\bar{\gamma}_t \in \Lambda$ such that $w(0) < w(\bar{\gamma}_t)$. By the continuous of u, there exist a neighborhood of $\bar{\gamma}_t$

$$\mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon}(\bar{\gamma}_t) = \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T; \|\tilde{\gamma}_t - \bar{\gamma}_t\| < \varepsilon\},$$

such that

$$w(\mathbf{0}) < w(\tilde{\gamma}_t), \qquad \text{for any } \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon}(\bar{\gamma}_t). \tag{5.30}$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon}(\bar{\gamma}_t)$ is $\mathcal{G}_t-$measurable and

$$P_0[\mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon}(\bar{\gamma}_t)] > 0. \tag{5.31}$$

Now we define

$$\hat{\tau}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} t, & \gamma \in \mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon}(\bar{\gamma}_t); \\ 0, & \text{else }. \end{cases}$$

Then $\hat{\tau}$ is a stopping.(5.30) and (5.31) lead to $w(\mathbf{0}) < P_0[w(B_{\hat{\tau}})]$, which contradicts (5.28). ☐

5.1.3 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Let u be a viscosity solution of PHJB equation (4.2), and $\tilde{u}$ be defined by (3.8).

It is sufficient to show $\tilde{u} \leq u$ since the inverse of which can be proved in a similar way. Otherwise, $\tilde{u}(\gamma_t) - u(\gamma_t) := \delta > 0$ for some $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$, $t < T$. Without loss of generality, take $\gamma_t = \mathbf{0}$ for convenience, that is

$$\tilde{u}(\mathbf{0}) - u(\mathbf{0}) = \delta > 0.$$

For sufficiently large m and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, (5.21) yields

$$u^m_\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) - u(\mathbf{0}) > \frac{1}{2}\delta.$$

Since $|g^m - g| \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, we have that for some fixed $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T$ and sufficiently large m,

$$|u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_T) - u(\bar{\gamma}_T)| = |g^m(\bar{\gamma}_T) - g(\bar{\gamma}_T)| < \frac{1}{2}\delta. \tag{5.32}$$

In view of Proposition 5.6, there is a time map τ^* such that $w := u^m_\varepsilon - u$ satisfies (5.22) and (5.23). Set $t := \tau^*(\bar{\gamma})$. We have

$$u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) \geq u^m_\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) - u(\mathbf{0}) > \frac{1}{2}\delta \tag{5.33}$$

and

$$u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) \geq u^m_\varepsilon(\gamma_s) - u(\gamma_s), \quad \forall \gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t}. \tag{5.34}$$

(5.32) and (5.33) show that $t < T$.

Define

$$\psi(\gamma_s) := u^m_\varepsilon(\gamma_s) + u(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \quad \gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t}. \tag{5.35}$$

Then $\psi \in C^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t})$ and (5.34) shows $\psi \in \mathcal{J}^-(u, \bar{\gamma}_t)$. Since u is a viscosity super-solution to PHJB equation (4.2), in view of (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq -D_t\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, \psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx}\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha) \qquad (5.36)\\
&= -D_t u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha)\\
&= \big[- D_t u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \hat{h}^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t))\big]\\
&+ \big[\hat{h}^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t)) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha)\big]\\
&+ \big[\sup_{\alpha \in U} h^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha)\big]\\
&+ \big[\sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^m_\varepsilon(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha)\big]\\
&:= I + II + III + IV.
\end{aligned}$$

Since u^m_ε is a classical solution to PPDE (5.17), we have

$$I = 0.$$

From estimates (5.20) and (5.19), we have

$$|II| < C\varepsilon,$$

From the estimates (5.4) and (5.19), we have

$$|III| < C\|\mathbf{P}^m\bar{\gamma}_t - \bar{\gamma}_t\| \leq C\|\mathbf{P}^m\bar{\gamma}_T - \bar{\gamma}_T\|.$$

Both (5.3) and (5.33) imply

$$IV < -C(u_\varepsilon^m(\bar{\gamma_t}) - u(\bar{\gamma_t})) < -\frac{1}{2}C\delta.$$

Let $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, (5.36) implies that $0 < -\frac{1}{2}C\delta$, which is a contradiction. The proof is complete.

5.2 Degenerate case

In this subsection, we only assume $\sigma\sigma^T \geq 0$, rather than the stronger non-degenerate condition (5.2). As a cost, we need the following extra smooth conditions on the coefficients.

(H3) *Functionals* $b : \hat{\Lambda}\times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : \hat{\Lambda}\times U \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, $g : \hat{\Lambda}_T \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $f : \hat{\Lambda}\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times U \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfy* (5.1). *Furthermore, for any* $\alpha \in U$, $\sigma(\cdot,\alpha)$, $b(\cdot,\alpha) \in C^{1,2}(\hat{\Lambda})$, $g \in C^{1,2}(\hat{\Lambda}_T)$, *and* $f(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot,\alpha) \in C^{1,2,2,2}(\hat{\Lambda}\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We have the following representation theorem.

Theorem 5.8. *(Representation Theorem) Suppose that (H3) holds. Let* $u \in C_b(\Lambda)$ *be a viscosity solution of* (4.2). *Then* $u = \tilde{u}$, *where* $\tilde{u}$ *is defined by* (3.8).

Proof. Similarly as in the non-degenerate case, we assume that f strictly decreases about $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Without loss of generate, i.e., there exists a constant C, for any $\gamma_t \in \hat{\Lambda}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\alpha \in U$ and y_1, $y_2 \in \mathbb{R}\,(y_1 < y_2)$,

$$f(\gamma_t, y_1, z, \alpha) - f(\gamma_t, y_2, z, \alpha) \geq C(y_2 - y_1). \tag{5.37}$$

Step 1. We prove $\tilde{u} \geq u$.

First we construct an approximation of $\tilde{u}$. For any $\delta > 0$, positive integral m, $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ and $\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$, let $X^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}$ and $Y^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}$ be the solutions of following stochastic equations

$$\begin{cases} X^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) = (\mathbf{P}^m\gamma_t)(s), & \text{all } \omega, 0 \leq s < t, \\ X^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) = (\mathbf{P}^m\gamma_t)(t) + \int_t^s b^m(X_r^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))dr & \\ \qquad + \displaystyle\int_t^s \sigma^m(X_r^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}, \alpha(r))\,dW(r) + \delta(\tilde{W}(t) - \tilde{W}(s)), & \text{a.e.-}\omega, \ \text{all } s \in [t,T]; \end{cases} \tag{5.38}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(s) &= g^m(X_T^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}) + \int_s^t f^m(X_r^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}, Y^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha(\cdot)}(r), Z^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(r), \alpha(r))\,dr \\ &\quad - \int_s^t Z^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(r)\,dW(s), \quad s \in [t,T]. \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{W}_{t;\,0\le t\le T}$ is an n-dimensional Brownian motion, independent of W, and σ^m, b^m, f^m, and g^m are defined in Section 5.1.1.

Define

$$\tilde{u}^{\delta,m}(\gamma_t) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\alpha(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}} Y^{\delta,m,\gamma_t,\alpha}(t).$$

Like Section 5.1.1, we have the following slightly different convergence:

$$|\tilde{u}^{\delta,m}(\gamma_t) - \tilde{u}(\gamma_t)| \le C\big(\mathrm{Osc}(\gamma_t, m^{-1}) + m^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \delta\big). \tag{5.39}$$

The value functions defined by, for any integer $i = 1, \cdots, m$,

$$V^{\delta,m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}) := \tilde{u}^{\delta,m}\big(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j \mathbf{1}_{[t_j,t]} + x_i \mathbf{1}_{\{t\}}\big), \quad t \in [t_{i-1}, t), \overrightarrow{x_i} = (x_1, \cdots, x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{i\times n},$$

are the viscosity solutions of the following state-dependent PDEs

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t V^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i}) - \delta^2 \Delta_{x_i x_i} V^{\delta,m,i} - \sup\limits_{\alpha\in U} H^{m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}, V^{m,i}, \partial_{x_i} V^{m,i}, \partial_{x_i x_i} V^{m,i}, \alpha) = 0, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (t, \overrightarrow{x_i}) \in (t_{i-1}, t_i) \times \mathbb{R}^{i\times n}, i = 1, \cdots, m; \\ V^{m,i}(t_i, \overrightarrow{x_i}) = V^{m,i+1}(t_i+, \overrightarrow{x_i}, 0), \qquad i < m, \overrightarrow{x_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{i\times n}; \\ V^{m,m}(T, \overrightarrow{x_m}) = G^m(\overrightarrow{x_m}), \qquad \overrightarrow{x_m} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \end{cases} \tag{5.40}$$

Since the coefficients in $H^{m,i}$ are twice differentiable, $V^{\delta,m,i}(\cdot, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, \cdot) \in W^{1,2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see Lions [25]), and there is a constant C, independent of m, i, and δ, such that

$$|\partial_{x_i x_i} V^{\delta,m,i}| < C\delta^{-2}, \tag{5.41}$$

$$|\partial_{x_i} V^{\delta,m,i}| < C, \tag{5.42}$$

$$\partial_{x_i x_i} V^{\delta,m,i} \ge -C. \tag{5.43}$$

Now we turn to our smoothing approximations. First We mollify $V^{\delta,m,i}$ similar as (5.10). Define the mollifier $\varphi : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$\varphi = \begin{cases} C\exp\big(-(1 - \big[(t-1)^2 + |x|^2\big])^{-1}\big), & (t-1)^2 + |x|^2 < 1, \\ 0, & else, \end{cases}$$

where C is the constants such that $\int \varphi = 1$, and the scaled mollifier

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(\cdot) := \varepsilon^{-n-1}\varphi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}).$$

We extend $V^{\delta,m,i}$ on the interval $t \in [-1, t_{i-1}]$ by

$$V^{\delta,m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}) = V^{m,i}(t_{i-1}, \overrightarrow{x_i}).$$

Now we mollify

$$V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i}(\cdot,\overrightarrow{x_{i-1}},\cdot) := V^{\delta,m,i}(\cdot,\overrightarrow{x_{i-1}},\cdot) * \varphi_\varepsilon, \quad \text{on } [t_{i-1},t_i].$$

Then mollify the equations (5.40), hence $V_\epsilon^{\delta,m,i}$ is the classical solutions of the following equation

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i}) - \delta^2\Delta_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i} - \sup\limits_{\alpha\in U} H^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\alpha) = I, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (t,\overrightarrow{x_i}) \in (t_{i-1},t_i)\times\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}, i=1,\cdots,m; \\ V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i}(t_i,\overrightarrow{x_i}) = V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i+1}(t_i+,\overrightarrow{x_i},0), \qquad i<m,\ \overrightarrow{x_i}\in\mathbb{R}^{i\times n}, \\ V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,m}(T,\overrightarrow{x_m}) = G_\varepsilon^m(\overrightarrow{x_m}), \qquad \overrightarrow{x_m}\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \end{cases} \tag{5.44}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I =& \Big[\sup_{\alpha\in U} H^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V^{\delta,m,i},\alpha)\Big] * \varphi_\varepsilon \\ &- \sup_{\alpha\in U} H^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate the low bound of I.

$$\begin{aligned} I \geq& \sup_{\alpha\in U}\Big[H^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V^{\delta,m,i},\alpha) * \varphi_\varepsilon\Big] \\ &- \sup_{\alpha\in U} H^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\alpha) \\ \geq& -\sup_{\alpha\in U}\Big|H^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V^{\delta,m,i},\alpha) * \varphi_\varepsilon \\ &- H^{\delta,m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\partial_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\alpha)\Big| \\ =& -\sup_{\alpha\in U}\Big|\big[\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{m,i}(\sigma^{m,i})^T\partial^2_{x_ix_i}V^{\delta,m,i}) * \varphi_\varepsilon - \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{m,i}(\sigma^{m,i})^T\partial^2_{x_ix_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i})\big] \\ &+ \big[(b^{m,i}\partial_{x_i}V^{\delta,m,i}) * \varphi_\varepsilon - b^{m,i}\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i}\big] \\ &+ \big[f^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V^{\delta,m,i},\sigma^{m,i}\partial_{x_i}V^{\delta,m,i}) * \varphi_\varepsilon - f^{m,i}(t,\overrightarrow{x_i},V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i},\sigma^{m,i}\partial_{x_i}V_\varepsilon^{\delta,m,i})\big]\Big| \\ :=& -\sup_{\alpha\in U}\Big|II + III + IV\Big|. \end{aligned}$$

Noting assumption (H3) and (5.41), we have for any $(t, x_i) \in [t_{i-1}, t_i) \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& |II(t, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, x_i)| \\
= & \left| \int_{B_\varepsilon(t,x_i)} \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{m,i}(\sigma^{m,i})^T \partial^2_{x_i x_i} V^{\delta,m,i}(s, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, y))\varphi(t-s, x_i - y)dtdy \right. \\
& \left. -\mathrm{Tr}\big(\sigma^{m,i}(\sigma^{m,i})^T(t, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, x_i) \int_{B_\varepsilon(t,x_i)} \partial^2_{x_i x_i} V^{\delta,m,i}(s, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, y)\varphi(t-s, x_i - y)dtdy\big) \right| \\
= & \Big| \int_{B_\varepsilon(t,x_i)} \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{ \big[(\sigma^{m,i}(\sigma^{m,i})^T)(s, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, y) - (\sigma^{m,i}(\sigma^{m,i})^T)(t, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, x_i)\big] \\
& \cdot \partial^2_{x_i x_i} V^{\delta,m,i}(s, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, y) \Big\} \varphi(t-s, x_i - y) dsdy \Big| \\
\leq & \; C\varepsilon\delta^{-2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, $|III| < C\varepsilon$ and $|IV| < C\varepsilon$. Choosing $\varepsilon := \delta^3$, we have

$$I > -C\delta.$$

Define

$$u^{\delta,m}(\gamma_t) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \chi_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(t) V^{\delta,m,i}_{\delta^3}(t, \gamma_t(t_1), \gamma_t(t_2) - \gamma_t(t_1), \cdots, \gamma_t(t_{i-1}) - \gamma_t(t_{i-2}), \gamma_t(t) - \gamma_t(t_{i-1})).$$

Then $u^{\delta,m}$ satisfies the inequality in the classical sense:

$$-\partial_t u^{\delta,m} - \delta^2 \Delta u^{\delta,m} - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h^m(\gamma_t, u^{\delta,m}, Du^{\delta,m}, D^2 u^{\delta,m}, \alpha) \quad > \quad -C\delta. \tag{5.45}$$

Besides, noting (5.39) and the inequality $|V^{\delta,m,i}_\varepsilon - V^{\delta,m,i}| < C\varepsilon$, and choosing $\varepsilon = \delta^3$, we have

$$|u^{\delta,m}(\gamma_t) - \tilde{u}(\gamma_t)| < C\big(\mathrm{Osc}(\gamma_t, m^{-1}) + m^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \delta\big).$$

From (5.32)-(5.34), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\partial_{x_i x_i} u^{\delta,m}| &< C\delta^{-2}, && (5.46) \\
|\partial_{x_i} u^{\delta,m}| &< C, && (5.47) \\
\partial_{x_i x_i} u^{\delta,m} &\geq -C. && (5.48)
\end{aligned}
$$

We assert that $\tilde{u} \geq u$. Otherwise, we would have

$$\inf\{\tilde{u} - u\} = -\nu < 0.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 5.1, there exist $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T$ and $t \in [0,T)$, for sufficiently large m and sufficiently small δ, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) < -\frac{\nu}{2}, \\ &u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) \le u^{\delta,m}(\gamma_s) - u(\gamma_s), \qquad \forall \gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\psi(\gamma_s) := u^{\delta,m}(\gamma_s) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) + u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t)\,(\gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t})$ lies in $\mathcal{J}^+(u, \bar{\gamma}_t)$. Since u is the viscosity super-solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \quad &\ge \quad -D_t\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, \psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx}\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha) \\ &= \quad -D_t u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{5.49}$$

Subtracting (5.45) from (5.49), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & C\delta \\ \ge \;& \delta^2 \Delta u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) + \sup_{\alpha \in U} h^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t), Du^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D^2u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t)) \\ & - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), Du^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D^2u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t)) \\ \ge \;& \delta^2 \Delta u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) + \inf_{\alpha \in U} \Bigg\{ \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big(\sigma^m(\sigma^m)^T - \sigma\sigma^T\big) D^2 u^{\delta,m}\Big](\bar{\gamma}_t) \\ & + (b^m - b)Du^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) + \Big[f^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^{\delta,m}, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha) - f(\bar{\gamma}_t, u, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha) \Big] \Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.50}$$

By the estimates (5.46)-(5.48) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 \Delta u^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) &\ge -C\delta^2 \\ \left| \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\big(\sigma^m(\sigma^m)^T - \sigma\sigma^T\big) D^2 u^{\delta,m}\Big](\bar{\gamma}_t) \right| &\le C\mathrm{Osc}(\bar{\gamma}_T, m^{-1})\delta^{-2}, \\ \big| (\sigma^m - \sigma) Du^{\delta,m}(\bar{\gamma}_t) \big| &\le C\mathrm{Osc}(\bar{\gamma}_T, m^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and from (5.37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f^m(\cdot, u^{\delta,m}, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha)(\bar{\gamma}_t) - f(, u, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha)(\bar{\gamma}_t) \\ \ge & - \left| f^m(\cdot, u^{\delta,m}, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha)(\bar{\gamma}_t) - f(\cdot, u^{\delta,m}, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha)(\bar{\gamma}_t) \right| \\ & + f(\cdot, u^{\delta,m}, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha)(\bar{\gamma}_t) - f(\cdot, u^{\delta,m}, \sigma^m Du^{\delta,m}, \alpha)(\bar{\gamma}_t) \\ \ge & - C\mathrm{Osc}(\bar{\gamma}_T, m^{-1}) + \frac{1}{2}C\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (5.50) yields

$$\delta C \geq -C\delta^2 - C\mathrm{Osc}(\bar{\gamma}_T, m^{-1}) - C\mathrm{Osc}(\bar{\gamma}_T, m^{-1})\delta^{-2} + \frac{1}{2}C\nu.$$

We deduce the contradiction by sending m to ∞ and then δ to 0.

Step 2. We show $\tilde{u} \leq u$.

For arbitrary fixed $\bar{\alpha} \in U$, consider the following systems

$$\begin{cases} X^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(s) = (\mathbf{P}^m\gamma_t)(s), & \text{a.e. } \omega, 0 \leq s < t, \\ X^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(s) = (\mathbf{P}^m\gamma_t)(t) + \int_t^s b^m(X_r^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha})dr & \\ \qquad + \displaystyle\int_t^s \sigma^m(X_r^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha})\, dW(r), & \text{a.e.-}\omega, \text{ all } s \in [t,T]; \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(s) &= g^m(X_T^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}) + \int_s^t f^m(X_r^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}, Y^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(r), Z^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(r), \bar{\alpha})\, dr \\ &\quad - \int_s^t Z^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(r)\, dW(s), \quad s \in [t,T]. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\gamma_t) := Y^{m,\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}(t),$$

$$V^{m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}) := u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}\big(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j \mathbf{1}_{[t_j,t]} + x_i \mathbf{1}_{\{t\}}\big), \quad t \in [t_{i-1}, t), \overrightarrow{x_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{i\times n}, i = 1, \cdots, m.$$

It is easy to see that $V^{m,i}$ is the viscosity solution of the following piecewise quasi-linear parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t V^{m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}) - H^{m,i}(t, \overrightarrow{x_i}, V^{m,i}, \partial_{x_i} V^{m,i}, \partial_{x_i x_i} V^{m,i}, \bar{\alpha}) = 0, \\ \qquad\qquad (t, \overrightarrow{x_i}) \in (t_{i-1}, t_i) \times \mathbb{R}^{i\times n}, i = 1, \cdots, m; \\ V^{m,i}(t_i, \overrightarrow{x_i}) = V^{m,i+1}(t_i+, \overrightarrow{x_i}, 0), \quad i < m, \ \overrightarrow{x_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{i\times n}; \\ V^{m,m}(T, \overrightarrow{x_m}) = G^m(\overrightarrow{x_m}), \qquad \overrightarrow{x_m} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \end{cases}$$

According to the parabolic PDE, thanks to the smooth coefficients σ^m, b^m and f^m, we have $V^{m,i}(\cdot, \overrightarrow{x_{i-1}}, \cdot) \in C^{1,2}([t_{i-1}, t_i] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, and there exists a constant C (independent of m, i) such that

$$|\partial_{x_i} V^{m,i}|, |\partial_{x_i x_i} V^{m,i}| < C. \tag{5.51}$$

Thus $u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}$ is the classical solution of the following PPDE:

$$-\partial_t u^{m,\bar{\alpha}} - h^m(\gamma_t, u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}, Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}, D^2 u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha}) = 0. \tag{5.52}$$

Using the density of step controls (see [22]), we just need to prove for arbitrary fixed $\bar{\alpha} \in U$,

$$Y_t^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}} \leq u(\gamma_t), \quad \forall \gamma_t \in \Lambda.$$

If it was not the case, we would have

$$\sup_{\gamma_t \in \Lambda} \big(Y_t^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}} - u(\gamma_t)\big) := \nu > 0.$$

Using the method in Step 1, combining $|u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\gamma_t) - Y_t^{\gamma_t,\bar{\alpha}}| < C \operatorname{osc}(\gamma_t, m^{-1})$, we deduce that there exist $\bar{\gamma} \in \Lambda_T$, $t \in [0,T)$, for sufficiently large m, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) > \frac{\nu}{2} \\ &u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) \geq u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\gamma_s) - u(\gamma_s), \qquad \forall \gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\psi(\gamma_s) := u^{\delta,m}(\gamma_s) - u(\bar{\gamma}_t) + u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t)$ $(\gamma_s \in \Lambda^{\bar{\gamma}_t})$ lies in $\mathcal{J}(u, \bar{\gamma}_t)$. Since u is the viscosity sub-solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq -D_t\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, \psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx}\psi(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha) \\ &= -D_t u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t) - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_x u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D_{xx} u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

Comparing of (5.52) and (5.53), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq h^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D^2u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), \bar{\alpha}) \\ &\quad - \sup_{\alpha \in U} h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D^2u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), \alpha) \\ &\leq h^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D^2u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), \bar{\alpha}) \\ &\quad -h(\bar{\gamma}_t, u(\bar{\gamma}_t), Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), D^2u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t), \bar{\alpha}) \\ &\leq \operatorname{Tr}\Big[\big(\sigma^m(\sigma^m)^T - \sigma\sigma^T\big)D^2u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}\Big](\bar{\gamma}_t) + (b^m - b)Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}(\bar{\gamma}_t) \\ &\quad \Big[f^m(\bar{\gamma}_t, u^{m,\bar{\alpha}}, \sigma^m Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha}) - f(\bar{\gamma}_t, u, \sigma^m Du^{m,\bar{\alpha}}, \bar{\alpha})\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the Lipschitz continuity of the coefficients and estimates (5.51), proceeding similarly as in Step 1, we obtain the contradiction. □

References

[1] B. Boufoussi, J. Van Casteren, and N. Mrhardy. Generalized backward doubly stochastic differential equations and SPDEs with nonlinear neumann boundary conditions. *Bernoulli*, 13(2):423–446, 2007.

[2] R. Buckdahn and J. Ma. Stochastic viscosity solutions for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. Part I. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 93(2):181–204, 2001.

[3] R. Buckdahn and J. Ma. Stochastic viscosity solutions for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. Part II. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 93(2):205–228, 2001.

[4] R. Buckdahn and J. Ma. Pathwise stochastic taylor expansions and stochastic viscosity solutions for fully nonlinear stochastic PDEs. *The annals of Probability*, 30(3):1131–1171, 2002.

[5] R. Buckdahn and J. Ma. Pathwise stochastic control problems and stochastic HJB equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 45:2224, 2007.

[6] P. Cheridito, H. M. Soner, N. Touzi, and N. Victoir. Second-order backward stochastic differential equations and fully nonlinear parabolic PDEs. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 60(7):1081–1110, 2007.

[7] R. Cont and D. A. Fournie. Change of variable formulas for non-anticipative functionals on path space. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 259(4):1043–1072, 2010.

[8] R. Cont and D. A. Fournie. Functional Ito calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1002.2446*, 2010.

[9] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P. L. Lions. *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations.* American Mathematical Society, 1992.

[10] K. Du and Q. Meng. A revisit to view W_2^n-theory of super-parabolic backward stochastic partial differential equations in $\mathbb{R}^d$. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 120(10):1996–2015, 2010.

[11] K. Du and S. Tang. Strong solution of backward stochastic partial differential equations in C^2 domains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–31, 2011.

[12] K. Du, S. Tang, and Q. Zhang. $W^{m,p}$-solution ($p \geq 2$) of linear degenerate backward stochastic partial differential equations in the whole space. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1105.1428*, 2011.

[13] B. Dupire. Functional Itô calculus. *Portfolio Research Paper*, 4, 2009.

[14] I. Ekren, C. Keller, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang. On Viscosity Solutions of Path Dependent PDEs. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1109.5971*, 2011.

[15] I. Ekren, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang. Optimal Stopping under Nonlinear Expectation. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1209.6601*, 2012.

[16] I. Ekren, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang. Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part I. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1210.0006*, 2012.

[17] I. Ekren, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang. Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part II. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1210.0007*, 2012.

[18] N. El Karoui, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez. Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Mathematical finance*, 7(1):1–71, 1997.

[19] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner. *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, volume 25. Springer Verlag, 2006.

[20] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113. Springer Verlag, 1991.

[21] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Methods of mathematical finance*, volume 39. Springer Verlag, 1998.

[22] N. V. Krylov. *Controlled diffusion processes*, volume 14. Springer, 1980.

[23] G. M. Lieberman. *Second order parabolic differential equations.* World scientific, 2005.

[24] P. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order equations and optimal stochastic control in infinite dimensions. Part II: Optimal control of Zakai's equation. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations and Applications II*, pages 147–170, 1989.

[25] P. L. Lions. Control of diffusion processes in RN. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 34(1):121–147, 1981.

[26] P. L. Lions. Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations part 2: viscosity solutions and uniqueness. *Communications in partial differential equations*, 8(11):1229–1276, 1983.

[27] P. L. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order equations and optimal stochastic control in infinite dimensions. Part I: The case of bounded stochastic evolutions. *Acta mathematica*, 161(1):243–278, 1988.

[28] P. L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics*, 326(9):1085–1092, 1998.

[29] P. L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations: non-smooth equations and applications. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics*, 327(8):735–741, 1998.

[30] N. Y. Lukoyanov. On viscosity solution of functional hamilton-jacobi type equations for hereditary systems. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 259:190–200, 2007.

[31] J. Ma, P. Protter, and J. Yong. Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly–a four step scheme. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 98(3):339–359, 1994.

[32] J. Ma and J. Yong. Adapted solution of a degenerate backward SPDE, with applications. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 70(1):59–84, 1997.

[33] E. Pardoux and S. Peng. Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations. *Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications*, pages 200–217, 1992.

[34] E. Pardoux and S. Tang. Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic PDEs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 114(2):123–150, 1999.

[35] S. Peng. Stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 30:284, 1992.

[36] S. Peng. BSDE and stochastic optimizations. *Topics in Stochastic Analysis*, 1997.

[37] S. Peng. Backward stochastic differential equation, nonlinear expectation and their applications. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, volume 901, pages 393–432, 2010.

[38] S. Peng. Note on viscosity solution of Path-Dependent PDE and G-Martingales. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1106.1144*, 2011.

[39] S. Peng and F. Wang. BSDE, Path-dependent PDE and Nonlinear Feynman-Kac Formula. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1108.4317*, 2011.

[40] J. Qiu and S. Tang. Maximum principle for quasi-linear backward stochastic partial differential equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 2011.

[41] H. M. Soner, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang. Wellposedness of second order backward SDEs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–42, 2011.

[42] S. Tang. Semi-linear systems of backward stochastic partial differential equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Chinese Annals of Mathematics*, 26B(3):437–456, 2005.

[43] S. Tang and F. Zhang. Path-dependent stochastic differential game and associated Isaacs equation: a viscosity solution approach. *Preprint*, 2012.

[44] L. Wang. On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations: II. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 45(2):141–178, 1992.

[45] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou. *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, volume 43. Springer Verlag, 1999.

[46] X. Y. Zhou. A duality analysis on stochastic partial differential equations. *Journal of functional analysis*, 103(2):275–293, 1992.